DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 845 SP 004 093

TITLE	Identifying Strengths of Effective Teachers and Training Them to Share These Strengths with Other Teachers. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Bellflower Unified School District, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.
PUB DATE	70
GRANT	OEG-0-9-144324-1815-725
NOTE	109p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.55
DESCRIPTORS	*Inservice Teacher Education, Teacher Attitudes, *Teacher Workshops, Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Dimensions of Self-Other Relationships, Dimensions of Teacher Relationships, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, MMPI, MTAI

ABSTRACT

A one-year staff development project was conducted to develop in teachers a knowledge and an acceptance of themselves as "persons who guide the learning of children as persons," and to train 20 exceptional teachers for leadership roles in the district. The summer workshop began with a 3-day encounter session which built group rapport and facilitated a program of self-awareness and innovative teaching methods. Activities in the workshop sessions (22 days throughout the year) dealt with peer dynamics, self-evaluation, video-tape techniques, and such improved teacher-student techniques as individualized instruction and problemsolving. The approach was one of dialogue, demonstration, and interaction. Each of nine staff members worked throughout the year as consultants in a specific area (e.g., elementary education, psychology, administration, and business). The 20 teachers then worked in their five schools as leadership teams during 20 days of released-time inservice training sessions involving the entire staffs of their buildings. Project evaluation included comparison of participating teachers with a control group using instruments to measure attitude, personality, peer relationships, and classroom climate. Project objectives were met to a statistically proven degree. Significant outcomes included attitude improvement, reduction of anxiety, increased self-knowledge, implementation of new teaching methods, and establishment of a teacher sharing program. (JS)

ED041845

FINAL REPORT

Sub. T

IDENTIFYING STRENGTHS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHERS AND TRAINING THEM TO SHARE THESE STRENGTHS WITH OTHER TEACHERS

[T

PROJECT # OEG-0-9-144324-1815-725
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT

JULY 1, 1969 TO JUNE 30, 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CHARMAYNE BOHMAN, PROJECT DIRECTOR

No Author

BELLFLOWER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
16703 SOUTH CLARK STREET
BELLFLOWER, CALIFORNIA 90706

[P

SP004093

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I - Introduction	1
CHAPTER II - Operation of the Program	
1. Planning	3
2. Participants	5
3. Staff	6
4. Orientation	8
5. Program Operation	9
6. Evaluation	11
CHAPTER III - Conclusions	18
CHAPTER IV - Appendix	20

APPENDIX

	Page
Appendix 1 - Criteria for Selection of Teacher Trainers and Nomination Form	20
2 - Table Showing Mix of Participants	22
3 - Summary of Encounter on Encounter Workshop	24
4 - Self Assessment Data Developed by Participants	33
5 - Participants' Evaluation of Project, Part I a. Use of Video Tape Equipment b. Use of Problem-solving Techniques for Classroom Behavior c. Use of Inquiry Methods d. Use of Self Evaluative Techniques	36
6 - Released Time for EPDA Project	45
7 - T O R I Processes, Developed by E. L. Blackman	55
8 - Dimensions of Teacher-Child Relationships Developed by O. J. Harvey	56
9 - Statistical Summary of Research Data: Classroom Climate a. Significance of the Differences Between the Experimental and Control Groups on the T O R I Pre and Post b. Significance of the Differences on the T O R I for the Experimental Teacher Group c. Significance of the Differences on the T O R I for the Control Teacher Group, Pre and Post d. Summary of the Mean Difference Pre and Post on the T O R I of the Experimental Teacher Group by the Director e. Summary of the Mean Difference Pre and Post on the T O R I of the Experimental Teacher Group by the Principal f. Summary of the Mean Difference Pre and Post on the T O R I of the Control Teacher Group by the Principal	57
10 - Statistical Summary of Research Data: Classroom Climate a. Significance of the Difference of the Classroom Climate of the Experimental Teacher Group as Evaluated by the Principal, Pre and Post b. Control Teacher Group as Evaluated by the Principal, Pre and Post	63

		Page
Appendix 10 -	c. Experimental Group as Evaluated by the Director	64
	d. Experimental Group's Self Rating with Principal's and Director's Comparison - Post	
	e. Control Group's Self Rating Compared with Principal's - Post	
11 -	Statistical Summary of Research Data: MMPI	67
	a. Significant Differences Between Experimental and Control Groups	
	b. Significance of Differences for Experimental Group, Pre and Post	
	c. Significance of Differences for Control Group, Pre and Post	
12 -	Statistical Summary of Research Data: MTAI	70
	a. Significant Differences between Experimental and Control Groups, Pre and Post	
	b. Significant Differences between Experimental Teacher Groups, Pre and Post	
	c. Significant Differences between Control Teacher Groups, Pre and Post	
13 -	Participants' Evaluation of Project, Part II	72
	a. Team Concept of Leadership	
	b. Involvement of Non-Project Teachers	
14 -	Comparison of Views of Principal's Role	75
15 -	Letter of Acceptance to the Program	78
16 -	Letter to Comparison Group	79
17 -	Letter to Parents Regarding Released Time for Project	80
18 -	Sample Building In-service Sign-up Sheet	81
19 -	Inquiry Training Materials	82
20 -	Responses of 2nd Graders on Inquiring into the Drinking Duck	95
21 -	Suggestions on How to Conduct Problem-Solving Group Discussions	96
22 -	Guidelines for Training EPDA Aides	98
23 -	Publicity	100
24 -	Roster of Participants	101

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of the EPDA Project in the Bellflower Unified School District was to successfully redefine the traditional concept of inservice by implementing a teacher-focused professional development program based on the sharing of unique teaching strengths and personal interaction among staff members.

The purpose was based on the premise that teachers have significant contributions to make to instruction and curriculum, and that there is a need to communicate with their colleagues in these areas. The idea that such a program could be successful was based on the further premise that cultivating change in individual teachers is one of the ways to change the instructional pattern in the educational system, or, another way of saying it: if you want to help the child, help the teacher first.

The design of the program was to encourage teachers to engage in projects they felt were relevant and useful. To do this, a committee of colleagues representing a broad spectrum of professional background and interest were especially trained in a leadership capacity to work as a team with building principals in devising a professional development program within their own buildings. The training program for this special core of teachers involved skills in working with peers and sharpening competencies in working with children in specific areas.

Following were the objectives of the program:

A. To increase the effectiveness of all teachers, trainers and trainees, through teacher-directed professional development programs.

B. To develop interpersonal growth of Bellflower teachers.

C. To stimulate and provide means for self evaluation of teacher effectiveness.

D. To change patterns and methods of directing learning experiences, with focus on pupil learning rather than teaching, through individualization of instruction, and utilization of inquiry teaching techniques.

E. To improve utilization of educational resources.

F. To improve teacher-child relationships.

It was a contention at the beginning of the program that most teachers were static in their professional development due primarily to inadequate professional development programs typical in the majority of school districts nationwide. Specifically, the needs addressed in our Project were as follows:

A. Need to seek more effective ways of helping teachers increase their effectiveness in the classroom.

B. Need to motivate teachers to engage in constant re-evaluation of their own effectiveness.

C. Need for teachers to see their role in the classroom as facilitators for learning rather than givers of information.

D. Need to retrain teachers for individualized approaches to instruction.

E. Need for better utilization of educational resources which are readily available in this District.

CHAPTER II. OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM

CHAPTER II. OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM

I. PLANNING

It was our intent to use the planning phase of the project

A. To add specific detail to the overall organization of the project.

B. To plan specific experiences which would provide unique professional development activities inherent in the goals of our project.

C. To select consultants to work in the training program who would be skilled and willing to try new approaches different from the typical college and district methods of teacher instruction.

As the planning phase developed, a disproportionate amount of time had to be spent rewriting the original proposal. At lease three rewrites were submitted before the project was finally approved. The final addendum included 24 pages of rewritten material. This delayed the real planning phase until late April, 1969.

The team who assisted during the planning phase included Dr. Wayne Young, Dr. Evelyn Blackman and Dr. Aileen Poole, Professors of Education, California State College at Long Beach. During this time, several planning consultations took place, brain-storming sessions, with the director and team consultants. Dr. Blackman assumed the chief task of designing a research model for meaningful evaluation of the program. Dr. Young assumed the task of meeting with the principals in the project schools in order to orient them to the goals and direction of the program. Dr. Poole worked primarily with the director in planning the summer workshop. All three members of the team assisted in general planning of workshop activities.

The significant aspects of the program developed during this time focused on the emphasis to be placed on developing cohesive personal relationships among members of the group, developing a keen sense of self-awareness for the purpose of self assessment of effectiveness, and developing skills in group dynamics. The plan that emerged for the workshop was as follows:

The summer workshop began with a three-day creative teaching encounter session under the direction of Dr. Mary Jo Woodfin, Associate Professor of Education, California State College at Long Beach. This encounter part of the workshop succeeded in building a cohesive group rapport among the twenty project teachers and helped them move toward a program of self-awareness. It also served to make them receptive to innovative methods of teaching.

Following the three-day encounter session in July, a five-day workshop which differed markedly from previous workshops that teachers had attended was held. The workshop was unique in the following ways:

A. The process would be different.

1. Dialogue and group interaction would replace lectures and group discussion.

2. Consultants would use non-directive techniques.

3. There would be daily planning.

B. Observation of the process would be used as an instructional technique.

The major and most significant modification to the program involved the selection of the participants. In the original research design, Dr. Blackman had developed a nomination form based on a scale to measure Teacher-Child Relationships developed by O. J. Harvey and a Dimensions of Self-Other Relationships developed especially for the project by Dr. Blackman. As part of the orientation to the project, the Director met with individual building staffs to hold preliminary discussions regarding the proposal and organization of the project. Basic to the selection program was the concept that peers would rank their colleagues according to the two scales mentioned above and provide data as a basis for selection of outstanding teachers. It became readily apparent as these informal discussions were held, that teachers would have no part in such a peer ranking, and that if this course were pursued, we would be unable to conduct the project in this district. Many teachers, angered by what they considered an entre to merit rating, expressed open hostility to such a selection procedure. In the original planning of the project, it did not occur to us that we would meet the wide-spread reluctance to participate in this program that we did. At this point, Dr. Poole and Mrs. Bohman, the Project Director, devised a nomination form (see Appendix 1) that dealt with general areas of strength but did not ask teachers to specifically rank individuals on specific strengths or weaknesses. The revised form was acceptable to teachers who, using the list of strengths as an over-all profile, subsequently placed one to three names in nomination to be participants in the training program. Four teachers were selected from each of the five schools based on the number of nominations submitted. A screening committee composed of the Deputy Superintendent, the principals of the five buildings and the project director reviewed the nominations. From this list thirty names were selected, twenty first choices and ten alternates. In no instance did the screening committee choose to eliminate any of the nominees. However, some of the teachers nominated by their peers chose not to participate, and some from the alternate list were selected. The final twenty participants selected left one building with five participants and one building with only three participants, the remaining buildings having four each.

Some errors were made in planning the year's program due in part, perhaps, to a lack of planning time. As was indicated, much of the time which had been allotted to planning activities was spent in rewriting portions of the original proposal. Basically, planning errors involved budget matters which subsequently had to be revised and approved. Enough time was not allotted for the creative teaching encounters nor for the inquiry training sessions.

Because the lack of time for adequate planning was an external restriction imposed by the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (i.e., rewriting the original proposal), it is not known whether or not this factor could be altered at another time.

2. PARTICIPANTS

The twenty participants as finally identified, included three men and seventeen women. As objective data will indicate, we achieved a personality, age, experience and grade level conglomerate which has added greatly to the success of our program (see appendix 2). The most important single factor affecting participant selection was the willingness on the part of each participant to engage in an unknown and in some instances, threatening personal and professional experience. The initial meeting of the participants with the project director was marked by apprehension, tempered only by curiosity and willingness to explore the unknown. This initial meeting was the only attempt made to orient the participants to the program. At this time we felt that the creation of an unstructured atmosphere which would stimulate maximum innovation and creative expression on the part of the participants was vital. For this reason the orientation sessions were limited to the building meetings referred to above and the first meeting of the participants to discuss the time schedule for project involvement: the three-day weekend, the five-day August workshop, and twelve days - September through June 1970. The general goals of the project which included the areas of emphasis such as individualizing instruction, developing self-awareness and improving teacher-child relationships were also discussed at this time. We purposely avoided the discussion of the teachers' role or planned content for the summer workshop so as not to structure the participants' thinking in terms of the experiences that lay ahead. This lack of structure proved to be a real source of apprehension and anxiety for many of the participants. However, it also proved to be one of the critical decisions for the project which accounted for our tremendous success.

The criteria for selection of participants proved highly satisfactory. Although it was the original intent to have participants nominated by their peers, a process which clearly affected the success of the program and which served to modify the nominating procedure developed spontaneously. At every building there was informal agreement by members of the staff as to who would be willing to be nominated. What in effect happened was that certain teachers indicated that if they were nominated, they would accept, while others apparently made it well-known that they did not want to be involved in such a project. This, in effect, imposed a preliminary screening restraint upon the selection of the participants that had not been written into the project. It now seems evident that this voluntary aspect imposed upon the selection process enhanced the effectiveness of the selection task. In addition to the mix of background and grade level, we specifically designed the program for teachers who had already demonstrated effectiveness and above-average strength in teaching performance. Our experience now shows us the importance of adding the voluntary dimension to the selection process.

Twenty seemed to be a highly workable group size. The fact that one school had three participants, three schools, four participants and one school, five participants seemed to have no effect on the success of the project in a given building. There is no evidence that geographic or demographic areas represented in the pilot project had any effect on the success of the program.

3. STAFF

Each staff member worked as a consultant in a specified area. Consultants were drawn from the fields of elementary education, psychology, elementary administration and business. Nine consultants worked with the participants during twenty days of workshop time extending over a 12-month period from July, 1969 through June, 1970.

The evaluation of the effectiveness of the staff and the areas each worked in showed a direct correlation to the amount of time spent in the program. That is—those consultants who worked the most hours with the participants received the highest rankings; those working the least amount of time, the lowest rankings.

Consultants who were rated most effective were rated high because of the following factors:

A. Their varying background which enabled them to bring new and varied experiences to the participants

B. Their excellent grasp of the goals and purposes of the project

C. Their willingness to use non-directive processes as an instructional technique and to divorce themselves from lectures and other directive methods

Seven of the nine consultants were briefed individually by the director on the dimensions of the project. This proved to be an effective and fruitful method of orientation. Use of staff could have been more effective if

A. Fewer consultants had been used (seven instead of nine) for longer periods of time

B. All consultants had been briefed privately on the project prior to their involvement

Following is a summary of the consultants role, background and type of involvement in the project.

Dr. Wayne Young, whose background is primarily in elementary administration, spent two comprehensive orientation sessions with building principals during the planning phase. We were sensitive at this time to the fact that principal's roles would be affected by a program which would involve teachers in leadership capacities. For this reason, Dr. Young spent a great deal of time involving the principals in dialogue concerning the changing role of administrators, teachers and pupils in public education. The principals and the project director, who participated in the dialogue, found these sessions to be most helpful: they served to clarify objectives, articulate needs and concerns, and served in a small measure to build a group esprit among the principals involved in the project.

Dr. Blackman and Dr. Poole also provided invaluable help during the planning phase. Dr. Blackman developed evaluation forms that were particularly pertinent for our project and met with the project teachers in groups of ten each to administer the instruments which were to provide us with the

base line data for evaluation: The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, the Teacher-Child Relationship form developed by O. J. Harvey, and the Dimensions of Self-Other Relationships developed by Dr. Blackman. Dr. Poole assisted in the development of the alternate nomination form and assisted greatly with the planning of the content of the summer workshop. She also assumed the responsibility for doing the evaluation of the project and very effectively conducted the feed-back session on test results to the participants.

No where is the influence of the kinds of consultants selected to work with the participants more dramatically illustrated than in the choice of Dr. Mary Jo Woodfin as leader of the encounter session held at the beginning of the summer session.

The project director met once with Dr. Woodfin to explain the unique purpose of this project and to relate the place of an encounter session to the overall program. There is no objective way to describe the effectiveness of Dr. Woodfin or to adequately relate the impact this experience had on participants and the subsequent success of this project.

Evaluations of the session were highly positive (see Appendix 3). Two subsequent encounter sessions were held throughout the year at the request of the participants. It is the unanimous feeling of the twenty participants that the encounter sessions were vital to their role in the project and that the success of the sessions was due entirely to the talents and capabilities of Dr. Woodfin.

Following the three-day encounter session, Dr. Ruth Larson, Associate Professor of Education at California State College at Dominguez Hills, and Dr. Ruth Martinson, Director of Teacher Education, California State College at Dominguez Hills, served as special consultants for the five-day workshop held in August, working primarily in the areas of individualizing instruction and self-assessment. The most exciting aspect of this five-day workshop was the tone they set and their method of working with the participants. While the areas of emphasis had to be identified and a tentative schedule developed prior to the workshop, we managed, in fact, to implement daily planning. Both Dr. Larson and Dr. Martinson worked in an informal setting, relying on non-directive techniques. Such techniques were vital as it was one of the primary objectives of the project to train teachers to become catalysts for change and to open up channels of communication with their colleagues. Had the consultants worked in traditional ways with teachers, they would have been reinforced in what we felt to be archaic and worn-out methods of professional development. Dr. Larson and Dr. Martinson worked with groups of nine to eleven each. During these sessions teachers discussed and evaluated ways of individualizing in the classroom. Although they were unaware of it at the time, Dr. Larson was drawing from these discussions criteria for self-assessment and formulating a guide for effective teaching. I make a point of the participants being unaware of this to reinforce the non-directive techniques used. At no time did she indicate to them that they were engaged in such a process. On the final day of the five-day workshop she presented her summary of what they had produced during the week (see Appendix 4).

Psychologist Barbara Neff worked in the areas of teacher-child relationships and the encouragement process to learning. Mrs. Neff relied on dialogue, role playing, and simulation techniques. As a regular member of the Bellflower Unified School District staff, she has been in constant demand by the

THE MARGINAL LEGIBILITY OF THIS PAGE IS DUE TO POOR ORIGINAL COPY. BETTER COPY WAS NOT AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF FILMING. E.D.R.S.

participants who consider her an invaluable adjunct of this project. Her services have been constant throughout the year, conducting in-service sessions and classroom demonstrations.

Stuart Gothold, formerly with the Los Angeles County schools office and an acknowledge authority in the field of inquiry, spent thirty hours working with the participants on inquiry methods. He was assisted by Bob Babcock, a member of the Los Angeles County Office of Schools consultant staff. In our original planning we had thought that Mr. Gothold could give a cursory overview of the inquiry techniques, but during the workshop the teachers indicated a strong desire to, if possible, complete a thirty-hour course which would ultimately give them a degree of expertise in the field of inquiry. We then secured approval from the Bureau of Education Professions Development to continue the services of Mr. Gothold during the school year. Mr. Babcock assisted in this very excellent training aspect of the program.

The one change in our workshop schedule involved the use of Regina Ferguson, Coordinator of Curriculum Materials in the Lawndale School District. Miss Ferguson came on short notice as a substitute for Dr. Larson who, because of a severe health problem, was not able to meet her full commitment with us for the five days. Miss Ferguson worked in the area of individualizing reading.

Through our agreement with Camera Systems Inc. for rental of video tape equipment, we were able to secure the services of Vincent Servin, sales consultant, who trained participants on use of the video tape equipment.

In summary we would say that the use of all the afore-mentioned consultants contributed to the success of our program. Several used a process that was directly applicable for the role of the participant in his building to work with colleagues. What we were seeking—models for innovative professional development techniques—we admirably achieved.

4. ORIENTATION PROGRAM

We feel that the three-day encounter with Dr. Woodfin was the most effective form of orientation to the project we could have devised. Basic to this whole project was the feeling of group rapport among the twenty participants, a need which will be clarified in the discussion of the participants' role in their building. We also discovered that the three-day encounter had to be reinforced with subsequent sessions. Again we requested permission to expend funds for as many sessions as we deemed necessary.

To anyone who is not conversant with the nature of encounter groups, some of the activities would seem bizarre. However, many of the group processes used by Dr. Woodfin were directly applicable to teacher-child as well as adult-adult relationships. This session served to orient the participants to the goals and purposes of the project, as well as clearly define a procedural path. This is best illustrated by one of the drawings done by one of the participants as an evaluation of the weekend session. His drawing showed the participants going up the mountain to an unknown situation, completely clouded in darkness. At the end of the three-day period, he showed the participants going down the same mountain filled with confidence and surrounded by light.

The encounter session focused on developing group rapport and openness to creative and innovative ways of thinking about teaching. Group processes, personal introspection, creative expression and non-verbal communication were explored. These experiences provided a real and vital impact on the participants and with the project director who participated fully in the encounter session and in every subsequent phase of the project.

5. PROGRAM OPERATION

The project, Identifying Strengths of Effective Teachers and Training Them to Share These Strengths with Other Teachers, was planned to fulfill program-based objectives which included certain objectives for the trainers and the setting up of programs in the five pilot buildings which would enable the trainers to have an impact on the total staffs at these buildings.

Many of the objectives aimed at certain kinds of behavior change in the teacher trainers were measured objectively and will be reported in Part 6 of this chapter. Subjective data in the form of a questionnaire completed at the end of this project period indicates that all of the program objectives including development of interpersonal growth, willingness to engage in self evaluation, utilization of individualized and inquiry focused teaching, and improvement of teacher-child relationships were met to the degree that the project could indeed be termed successful (see Appendix 5).

Following is a summary of the several components of the program and how each related to the school and the classroom situation:

A. To provide special training in a unique workshop context during the summer preceding and throughout the program school year (1969-1970).

The activities in the workshop sessions dealt with peer dynamics, inquiry methods, self evaluation, use of video tape equipment and improved teacher-child relationships through problem-solving techniques. The approach—one of dialogue, demonstration, and inter-action—was successful and fruitful; it produced a highly motivated corp of teachers in the Bellflower Unified School District. Of 20 participants -

(1) 20 used the video tape equipment for demonstration, self evaluation or classroom instruction. In addition to the participants, there was 50% utilization of the equipment by non-project staff at the five pilot schools;

(2) 15 used problem-solving techniques as a guidance technique with their children;

(3) 16 instigated inquiry learning as a regular part of classroom instruction (four kindergarten and first grade teachers did not consider it applicable).

(4) 17 made real efforts at individualizing their instructional program.

(5) 16 used various means for conscious self evaluation. Techniques cited were student response, video tape, tape recorder, use of the self evaluative instrument developed during the summer workshop, dialogue with other teachers.

B. To utilize the participants as a leadership corps for in-service training at the building level.

At all five pilot schools the participants functioned effectively as a leadership team. All 20 of the participants provided leadership for one or more professional meetings as demonstrators or discussion leaders.

C. To clearly redefine and describe the processes and methods which should be used in working with teachers in a professional development program.

"Traditional" in-service meetings were not held at the five pilot schools for the 1969-1970 school year. At one school, three meetings were held which did not conform to the projects goals, but these were held at the express wish of the principal and were apart from the team's over-all program. Benefits cited by participants included marked improvement in staff rapport, articulation (for the first time) between grade levels, improved teacher-principal relationship, more cooperation and sharing among teachers, freedom to share without being a "show off," more meaningful in-service meetings.

D. To modify the teaching schedule at the pilot buildings to enable intensive professional development programs to be effective.

The five pilot schools were each given two minimum days per month for professional activities (see Appendix 6).

E. To gradually engage non-participants at the five pilot buildings in a sharing program.

All pilot schools were successful in engaging non-project teachers in a sharing program.

The major hypothesis to be tested in this project was whether or not a group of teachers specially trained to set up professional development programs in their buildings could be successful in engaging an entire staff in an innovative service program. It is now certain that this can be done.

Each of the components of the program not only related effectively to the other but, in a mechanical sense, were inter-dependent facets. For example, the ability to relate to peers effectively was enhanced by the personal encounter sessions held as part of the substantive content of the

program. Improvements in changing teacher behavior directly affecting student learning were predicated upon the ability of the participants to relate effectively to their peers. Thus, those facets of the program geared to the classroom situation such as inquiry methods, individualizing the program, and using problem solving techniques with children could not be effectively implemented without the increased sensitivity at the peer level.

As part of the program content, teachers were provided with in-depth study in adapting Rudolf Dreikurs' methods for problem solving activities with children, reorganizing classrooms for individualized approaches, using video tape equipment for demonstration and self evaluative processes. Our evaluation of the effectiveness of each of these indicates a high degree of success.

The beginning and ending dates provided a program of one calendar year. During this time the participants spent approximately 22 days in workshop programs and approximately 20 days engaged in professional in-service meetings in their buildings. Consultants were used throughout the duration of the program and the project director worked very closely with the participants for the entire twelve-month period. Participants indicated that more time was needed for feed-back kinds of meetings which were virtually impossible without some release time which was not allotted. There is a real need for released time for unstructured activities such as planning professional development activities in addition to the released time for staff development meetings.

In terms of the project, one year is woefully inadequate. At least another year is need to re-inforce and firmly establish the innovative aspects instigated at the pilot schools, and a third year is needed to complete the desired impact on the non-project schools.

6. EVALUATION

Introduction

The Bellflower EPDA project was designed to select 20 outstanding teachers who had demonstrated both classroom effectiveness and peer leadership, and to augment their skills so that they might be shared with their colleagues. It was proposed that this staff development model would ultimately offer to a teacher the kind of help that she would be most likely to accept, the help of a fellow teacher.

The evaluation design was developed cooperatively with the district and the consultant staff as soon as the decision was made to apply for the grant. Since a three phase sequential training program was proposed, the evaluation design was constructed to measure three phases which had the capability for three kinds of change: (1) changes in the professional competence of the selected teachers who would themselves become teacher-trainers; (2) growth and development among the colleagues who would be helped; and (3) ultimately, changes in the children who were taught by both groups of teachers in the target schools.

Since the funded phase of the project for 1969-70 involved only a concentrated staff development program for the 20 teachers while they were

working with their colleagues, evaluation for the first phase was focused on changes in the selected 20 teachers themselves. It was hypothesized that as they became more aware of their function, not only as teachers of pupils but also as teachers of peers, their increased capability could be evaluated by testing them and having them rated by their supervisors.

Objectives

The project objectives to be measured were

(1) To develop in teachers a knowledge and an acceptance of themselves as persons who guide pupils' learning.

(2) To train exceptional teachers for leadership roles in the district.

Research Design

Population

Initial plans for selection of the 20 participants included clearly defining selection criteria which could then become baseline data for measuring change. It was intended that the fellow teachers who were to be helped would select the helpers. Announcement of the project, however, aroused such feelings of threat within the district that this method was discared in favor of selection by the staff. Although the original method was not carried out as planned, the fact that selection criteria were carefully delineated resulted in the choice of a more homogeneous group than might have been chosen otherwise. The development of criteria also served to bring about agreement among staff and consultants, not only about kinds of persons to be chosen, but also in the project objectives and in the nature of the changes that were sought.

Ultimately the participants were nominated because of their teaching skills, but were selected primarily for their potential for communicating these strengths to colleagues. The twenty selectees were chosen from five different schools. Twenty other teachers were drawn at random from other schools in the district and were presumed to be representative of district personnel who did not have the project experience.

Instrumentation

A. Standardized Instruments

Two standardized instruments were administered in May, 1969 and June, 1970 to all participants:

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)
Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI)

B. Non-Standardized Instruments Involved

The Dimensions of Self-Other Relationships (Peer relationships), developed by E. L. Blackman of California State College at Long Beach, was administered in May, 1969 and June, 1970, to all participants. In June the Project Director and Principals rated all experimental teachers.

The Dimensions of Teacher Relationships (classroom climate), adapted from the O. J. Harvey Teacher Rating Scale, was taken by all participants at the end of the project.

Description of data gathering instruments

A. The MMPI is made up of 550 statements to be marked true, false, or cannot say. Among the many scoring scales that have been noted to distinguish between successful and non-successful teachers, five scales were scored for this project: SI (social introversion); MF (masculinity-femininity); At (manifest anxiety); and two scales, K and L which were developed to ensure that test takers were responding appropriately to the test.

The K scale was thought to be one of the best discriminators for identifying superior teachers, as well as for distinguishing between teachers and people who were not teachers. Similarly, MF scores have been found to be higher for teachers than for persons in other occupations.

B. The MTAI has been the most popular instrument for the measurement of teacher attitudes. It included 150 statements about children, teachers, and teaching, such as "Teachers should not expect pupils to like them." Teachers were asked to mark each statement either strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree. Scores made on the test could be compared with those made by other experienced teachers. According to the manual, the inventory was designed to predict how well a teacher would get along with his pupils, and whether he would find teaching a satisfactory career.

C. The TORI processes were intended to measure the personal and social growth that was presumed to result from the interaction which everyone has with the various groups to which he belongs. The four processes of Trust, Openness, Realization and Interdependence were built around questions which were thought to confront everyone who is in a group: (1) How much can I trust?; (2) How intimate can I be?; (3) What do I want out of life?; and (4) How do I influence my world? From the resolution of these questions persons developed their life styles.

For this study, E. L. Blackman of California State College at Long Beach had developed six pairs of words (semantic differentials) such as spontaneous-reticent, between which the teacher made a choice along a scale from +3 to -3.

D. The Dimensions of Teacher-Child Relationships (classroom climate) was adapted from L. J. Harvey. It was intended to measure teachers' overt resourcefulness, dictatorialness and punitiveness.

Analysis

Means, standard deviations and tests on analysis of variance were computed for the four instruments used. Comparisons were made between pre and post scores for the selected and comparison teachers.

Findings

Objective #1 - to develop in teachers a knowledge and an acceptance of themselves as persons who guide the learning of children as persons.

The results of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory showed positive results favoring the selected teachers. The project teachers saw themselves as improved in their relationships with pupils at the end of the year. Since they were a selected group from the beginning, they had a higher average score than the comparison group on the pre-test, as would be expected. In addition, however, while the comparison group tested at the same level both before and after the project, with an average of 35%, the selected teachers increased their scores during the project from the 47th to the 62nd percentile, a statistically significant amount. (See Appendices 12.a. and 12.b.)

Higher MTAI scores would be considered characteristic of teachers who tended to maintain a harmonious relationship with pupils, and who can establish cooperative working relationships with them. According to the MTAI test manual, teachers who scored high tended to like children and to enjoy teaching. They worked with pupils in a secure atmosphere involving mutual respect. Characteristically, people with high scores had a sense of proportion, of humor, of justice, and of honesty. They fostered group solidarity in the classroom, based upon setting common goals, on common understanding, and on mutually arrived at achievement.

It would be concluded that the project participants had demonstrated that they had attained the first project objective, to develop knowledge and acceptance of themselves in their roles as teachers.

Less conclusive were the findings from the TORI processes checklist. The selected teachers saw themselves differently from the very beginning than the comparison teachers on Realization, but not on the other three processes of Openness, Trust, and Interdependence. The project teachers thought of themselves as more eager, fluent, participative, as more confident and having more self-esteem than the comparison group. Although both groups raised their scores on the post-test, the differences were so small that they could be attributed to chance.

Objective #2 - to train exceptional teachers for leadership roles in the district.

A leadership role implies that a leader, who is in advance of a group in some respect, is capable of directing, guiding, or inducing the group to follow the direction that he sets. "Follow me" is the classic statement and pose. Whether the group will indeed follow is dependent to a large degree on their confidence in him. It can by hypothesized that his potential for inspiring confidence is meaningfully related to his own self-confidence.

In this EPDA project the 20 experienced teachers who were selected for the project were presumed to have been chosen as being in advance of the average teacher in their knowledge and understanding of the teacher's role in the learning process. The workshops and consultant presentations were framed to offer opportunities for the group both to learn and to accept this leadership role. The questions to be posed by the data for the first year

were framed to offer opportunities for the group both to learn and to accept this leadership role. The questions to be posed by the data for the first year were, could these teachers acquire the necessary confidence for this role, and could their district principals and project director detect a change in them.

Of the five scales scored for the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory taken before and after the project period, two scales (L and K) concerned the validity of test taking. Both the selected teachers and the comparison teachers produced scores within the validity range, and it was therefore possible to have confidence in the test results. On two scales, SI and MF, the findings were not significant and would be presumed to have happened by chance. No greater changes took place in the selected teachers than in the comparison group with respect to social participation or emotional involvement, and in the masculinity-femininity dimension.

Significant findings were found, however, on the manifest anxiety scale. The project teachers gained significantly in reduction of manifest anxiety or in their assurance as compared with the other group which remained the same. The difference, significant at the 5% level of confidence, was noted to be phrased spontaneously throughout the project by teachers who said that they were now certain and had confidence that they could go ahead with new ideas, materials and methods.

Both the project director and the principals of the five schools rated the teachers in May, noting items of the TORI processes and Classroom Climate Scale on which they thought teachers had or had not changed. Principals tended not to see much change in Classroom Climate, where the director noted gross change, significant beyond the 1% level of confidence. Since, as has been noted above, real teacher changes were measured, it would appear that the closer relationship of the director to the project and its objectives led to a different perception of the teachers' growth. This in turn would suggest the need for closer involvement of the building principals with the leadership roles of teachers as they are given the opportunity to emerge.

Both principals and the project director saw significant changes, at the 1% level, in trust and openness. Interdependence showed significant change at the 5% level for principal raters, the 1% level for the director. The director only also saw changes in realization (5% level), not significantly noted by the principals. Comparison teachers were not rated by principals as changing significantly.

To summarize with respect to project objective #2, the results are also positive. Participants changed significantly on the MMPI in their ability to function confidently in the school setting, a presumed prerequisite to stimulating others to follow. Their perceived changes were more apparent to the project director than to the building principals.

Subjective Evaluation

In addition to the instruments used to obtain hard data, questionnaires and feed-back conferences were used throughout the project: Questionnaires were used to evaluate the following components of the program

a. encounter sessions
b. workshop sessions

c. use of video tape equipment
d. impact on pilot buildings
e. involvement of non-project teachers
f. affect on role of the principal
g. concept of team leadership

Detailed accounts of these questionnaires can be found in the Appendix. Some have been summarized elsewhere in this report. Findings not previously covered are

The Team Concept of Building Leadership

Participants at two buildings felt the concept worked very effectively. Participants at two buildings had some problems in the beginning and cited equal sharing of responsibility and lack of frequent meetings as the two major obstacles. However, both of these buildings resolved their problems by the fourth month of the project. One building had major problems of effective team leadership that were not resolved. Problems cited and observed by the director were (1) lack of support for and involvement in the team by the building principal, (2) no regularly scheduled meetings, (3) unresolved personality differences among members of the team. (See Appendix 13.)

Involvement of Non-Project Teachers in a Sharing Program

All buildings reported success in involving non-project teachers. (See Appendix 13.)

Affect of Project on Principal's Role

Of the five pilot schools, participants at two buildings noted definite change in the principal's role; participants at two buildings seemed undecided; and participants at one building felt definitely that there had been no change in their principal's role.

By comparison, principals themselves viewed their roles this way - two thought their roles had changed; one saw some change; two saw no change in their own role.

It is interesting to note that only in two instances did the participants view the change in the principal's role as did the principal. See chart below: (Also, see Appendix 14)

		Teacher's Response	Principal's Response
Did the role of the principal change?	School A	Yes	Yes
	B	No	No
	C	Undecided	Yes
	D	Yes	Undecided
	E	Undecided	No

Follow-up

Because of the success of this program, it is hoped that this program will be financed at district expense another year. Such a proposal will be submitted to the Board of Education. Further funding would enable us to evaluate continued progress of participants, impact on other professional staff and ultimately, the effect on children's learning. As any continuation of such a program comes at a time of financial crises for California schools, plans for long-term evaluation are uncertain at this time.

CHAPTER III. CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER III. CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The project objectives were met to a statistically proven degree. The relationship of these findings, however, to the ultimate goals of improving other professional staff and, finally, children's learning, has not been tested. If one buys the premise, however, that helping teachers grow in terms of knowledge, attitudes, and methods ultimately helps children, then the statistical evidence lends credence to the inference that learning in the participant's classrooms has improved.

Throughout the project feed-back sessions were held and questionnaires were sent to participants. The following represent a consensus of the participants, principal and project director:

Outcomes

The most significant outcomes of the Project are

1. The growth in attitudes characteristic of good teaching as measured on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory
2. The significant reduction in manifest anxiety as measured on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory
3. Increased self knowledge acquired by the participants
4. The implementation of new teaching methods: individualized instruction, inquiry techniques and problem solving
5. Knowledge and use of new equipment: video tape
6. The establishment of a teacher sharing program
7. A continuous feedback through questionnaires and conferences

Impact on Host Institution

The major impact has been the successful trial of a new approach to professional development. As a result, a administratively supported plan to enlarge the program to non-pilot schools will be submitted to the Board of Education. This proposal will include a district-wide plan for released time for all elementary schools in the district for professional development activities.

Major Strengths of the Program

The use of

1. Outside evaluators

2. Administrative support for released time for EPDA activities

3. Involvement of teachers in leadership and planning

4. Improved teacher-teacher and teacher-administrator communication

5. Lack of support and involvement of all principals in the pilot program

Influence of Program on Future Roles

1. Developing an improved child-oriented program with more experimentation and increased individualization

2. Augmenting the leadership involvement of other staff

3. Becoming more proficient in problem solving and inquiry

4. Sharing more freely new methods

Summary

That the major objectives of the project were successfully accomplished is now a matter of statistical and empirical evidence. The program was successful in bringing about significant changes in knowledge, attitudes and methods of the participants; the program was successful in redefining the concept of in-service and moderately successful in changing administrative roles; the program was significantly successful in its impact on the district, gaining administrative support for new approaches to professional development and instituting shortened days for in-service activities.

Our recommendations to the Bellflower Unified School District as a result of our project are as follows:

1. Continue to seek funding sources to augment the district-funded project for 1970-71.

2. Include building principals in the planning, direction, and implementation of the project to a greater degree than was possible during 1969-70

3. Continue the evaluation of the project by focusing on changes in the peers of the selected teachers as they work with them

4. Extend this evaluation to include changes in children when the district can offer to all teachers the additional time devoted to staff development for project teachers this year.

CHAPTER IV. APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1.

Educational Services - EPDA Project Director

BASIC CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF TEACHER TRAINEES

Which teacher(s) on your staff in your judgment has (have). . . . . .

Attitudes and Behavior Toward Children

1. Seen their role as one who is a guide in the learning process instead of a giver of information.
2. Placed the responsibility of learning on the learner by providing many opportunities for self-direction, hypothesizing and generalizing.
3. Provided many opportunities for creative expression through art, music, rhythms, dance, storytelling, dramatic play, oral activities.
4. Tried new curriculum approaches and materials.
5. Arranged learning tasks appropriate to the ability of the learner.
6. Set realistic learning goals on an individual pupil basis.
7. Created a supportive and accepting atmosphere which helped the child to develop a realistic self concept.
8. Evaluated each individual student in terms of his own growth.
9. Responded intelligently and perceptively to individual pupil needs.
10. Used a variety of teaching resources and materials.
11. Viewed grading and other evaluative measures as learning tools.
12. Seen very few pupils as "behavior problems."

Attitudes and Behavior Toward Colleagues

1. Shared ideas with me and sought help from colleagues and resource personnel.
2. Assumed full share of extra responsibilities at school.
3. Is someone I have trusted as a professional colleague.
4. Parents have shown confidence in.
5. Been relaxed under pressure and has exhibited a sense of humor.
6. Has had a stimulating influence on other staff members.

NOMINATION FORM

We would like you to help us choose a corps of 20 teachers from these five schools;

Horace Mann
Thomas Jefferson
Esther Lindstrom
Ernie Pyle
Ramona

We are soliciting the help of every teacher directly involved in the in-service project in the selection of teacher trainees. The nomination procedure will be based on the subjective judgment of a competent jury (peers, principals and central office resource personnel) using baseline criteria.

These teachers will become teacher-trainers in the Bellflower schools; therefore, you should be as selective as possible within your knowledge of your peers, as these teacher-trainers will be working with you in the future.

Please select a teacher who has had at least three years teaching experience in <u>this</u> district.

Nominations should be based on how you personally feel your colleagues have best demonstrated behavior and attitudes that best compare with the over-all criteria as presented here. You may nominate 1, 2 or 3 teachers. You may nominate yourself.

Names(s) of teacher(s) selected by you:

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX 2. CHART SHOWING MIX OF PARTICIPANTS

Participant	Yrs. Teaching Experience	Grade Levels Taught	Subject Matter Specialty	Age	Sex	Highest Degree Held
1.	4	3-4 comb., 3, kindergarten	Early childhood educ., music & social studies	30-39	F	B.A.
2.	5	1, 2, 3	Reading	20-29	F	B.A.
3.	10	1, 3, 4, Adult Educ.	English	30-39	F	B.S.
4.	18	1, 2, 3	Language Arts, math	40-49	F	B.S.
5.	35	Kindergarten through 8	Reading readiness	over 50	F	B.A.
6.	16	Kindergarten, 1, 2, 3, 4	Art	30-39	F	B.S.
7.	18	1, 2, 3, 4	Math	40-49	M	M.A.
8.	16	Kindergarten, 1	Art and science	40-49	F	B.A.
9.	16	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6	Math and social studies	40-49	M	M.A.
10.	15	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & combinations	Reading, perception (visual & auditory) & physical training	40-49	F	B.A.
11.	20	2, 3, 4, 6, Adult educ.	Math and drama	over 50	F	B.S.
12.	19	2, 3, 3-4, 4	Art, music and history	30-39	F	B.A.
13.	5	4, 5, 6	Math	20-29	M	B.A.
14.	8	4 & 5	Math, reading	40-49	F	M.A.

CHART SHOWING MIX OF PARTICIPANTS

Participant	Yrs. Teaching Experience	Grade Levels Taught	Subject Matter Specialty	Age	Sex	Highest Degree Held
15.	12½	Kindergarten	Math	40-49	F	B.A.
16.	10	5 & 6	Social studies	40-49	F	B.A.
17.	3½	3	Science, language and social studies	30-39	F	B.A.
18.	6	5	Science and art	40-49	F	B.A. & R.N.
19.	12	2 & 3	English	Over 50	F	B.A.
20.	11	2, 3, 4	Language and math	30-39	F	M.A.

APPENDIX 3.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS OF ENCOUNTER WORKSHOP

1. <u>How would you describe the effects of this workshop on you?</u>

I was extremely impressed by the leadership techniques and ideas expressed. The whole weekend was a personally warmth fulfilling experience.

I have a much closer relationship with the group. Hopefully, they understand me more as an individual.

This has been the most unusual experience I've ever experienced. I feel more self confident, because many others have the same feelings as I.

Uncertain - not enough time to really evaluate.

Made me feel a definite part of the group in so many respects besides socially.

I felt that I have become much more aware of others with whom I have merely before come in contact with.

I feel that this experience has given me the confidence I here-to-fore lacked in sharing ideas, also I have become more keenly aware and tolerant of the attitudes and ideas of my peers.

I cherish the involvement I have obtained.

I have a more intimate relationship with group members - they have become people instead of teacher figures. I also was impressed by the passive role of the leader.

Exhilarating - supportive - tension relieving.

I believe the workshop has helped me become more aware of people's personalities, feelings and abilities. It also helped me to know myself better.

It has been most beneficial in many ways including helping us see ourselves and each other more effectively.

It gave me a feeling of warmth. A chance to take the time to stop and look at myself and others—to see how much we are alike.

Warm, friendly, stimulating, motivating.

I have made so many friends that I feel I can really call a friend and discuss problems with them freely—no fear of rebuff or aloneness.

Loosened me up, made me aware of the various fine character traits of the others in the program. I feel that we will go far this year.

A release of inner tension as I discuss things with my peers. My defensive attitude has been dispelled.

I feel that this group of twenty people is now able to work together as a cohesive unit. Comparisons are being made, attitudes are changing and concepts are broadening.

It has brought me the satisfaction of a revival of an inner peace and for the first time I feel on the inside of a group rather than sitting out and wathcing others.

Better acquaintance with others involved; more ability to open to strangers; restful as well as challenging. Re-inforced the psychology of leader-group knowledge (i.e., good practical modes with which to work).

It has re-inforced my feelings that we shouldn't be afraid to reveal ourselves to others—to be ourselves—to show affection. If others withdraw it's their loss.

2. <u>What changes, if any, do you plan to make in your work with children as a result of this workshop?</u>

Having more kinetic experiences in smaller groups. Letting children discover each other taking more of their own directions. Be a much better sensitive listener and very aware of avoiding scapegoating.

I hope to be able to go back to a more creative and interesting way of teaching which I have experienced in the past, but the last two years I was tired of resisting the system.

I have always tried to be sensitive to children's needs, now, I think I can see them in a much greater depth. I believe I'll be more aware.

Unknown—first I must determine what change has taken place in me.

More group activities and freedom of choice from a structured program.

I think I shall take a more personal interest in my children and really try to see a child as an individual.

A clarification of assignments (i.e., to send children off to work with a definite goal, a time limit, etc.). I felt this was why the small groups were so successful—we all knew our goals.

I plan to use the various techniques we used to continue personal involvement with my children.

Try to make the class more responsible for self—give better directions, with more definite limits—e.g., time, materials, and try to let them go on from there. Also, keep in mind each individual child.

I feel I can be more open and uninhibitied with children.

Try to make children feel more comfortable in order that they can more freely express themselves.

I will look for positive qualities, try to anticipate feelings and in simple ways (as illustrated by the leader) give them opportunities to create, feel and react to situations.

I especially liked the qualities of leadership shown by Mary Jo. I hope to learn to use some of her techniques of giving suggestions then backing off) more often in my class.

I will introduce the school year by giving my students time to look at themselves and every so often take time with them to take stock.

Give more individual attention and group sessions. Give children an opportunity to express themselves freely and get to know their peers in a different light.

I plan to listen more and talk less. Let the children try out new things I may not even approve of—but, try them with an open mind.

I hope that I can make a more complete assessment of each child's worth and to help that child see his own worth and help him let others see it.

I would like to attempt some type of group process within my own classroom. I believe children can and should share their ideas and feelings with each other.

Try to develop this feeling I have developed for caring—taking care of others.

Be more open—less rigid—less "schedule minded"—as far as they're concerned—but holding to "teacher goals" as much as possible for the growth of the children.

Take time to listen to what they have to say even though it may shorten a planned lesson (or eliminate!!!!!).

3. <u>What changes, if any, do you plan to make in your relationships with other staff members as a result of this workshop?</u>

Have far more appreciation of others strengths and abilities and perhaps try to express but more genuine feelings.

Try to listen and at the same time reflect some of the warmth and closeness felt during our sessions at Peace Corps.

Try to see the good qualities in all teachers and let them know how I feel about these, also, how we all can profit by sharing them with others.

Would love to develop more feeling for themselves more considerate of their feelings.

Less critical—more understanding.

Again confidence is the key word. With this greater confidence I feel I can become more open with the staff.

I plan to be more [illegible] myself and go out of my way more for others [illegible] my usual pattern.

I hope to use this knowledge to strengthen our faculty group.

THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT MAY HAVE POOR LEGIBILITY DUE TO THE NATURE OF THE ORIGINAL COPY. BETTER COPY WAS NOT AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF FILMING. E.D.R.S.

Actively seeking personal relationships, look'ng for qualities I can respond to—not quite so reserved.

I feel we will be less hesitant in our communication so ideas will flow freely.

Try to open broader lines of communication and get to know and understand them better as I hope they get to know and understand me better.

I plan to look for their good qualities and abilities and encourage them to share with others.

I don't have much of a problem with others but I want to be careful not to try and control so much, to listen to others more. Sometimes I'm too self assured.

I feel a closer kinship to those that participated—I don't think it has changed my relationship to other staff members.

Be warm, friendly (although I feel I am)—try to know and better understand each individual. Try to share ideas for the benefit of children.

A disappearance of the "I" in contacts with staff and appearance of "you", "we" and "us".

I feel closer rapport with members of this group than I expected. I now have no second thoughts about how to interrelate with each member of the group. We all share common interests.

I will try to be more open with other members of the staff.

Hopefully, more accepting of differences and help to be a flux or cohesive influence—to sow ideas and insert less "I think".

Treat them frankly and openly with friendship, hoping they will reciprocate.

4. <u>What other changes in behavior, if any, in addition to questions 2 and 3 above do you plan to make as a result of this workshop?</u>

Be a much more acute listener and not monopolize a position of authority.

Not come on as strong as I do sometimes.

Be willing to try the un-experienced and untried suggestions which we'll be sure to explore. I want to try to withhold judgement until the last.

Probably try to overcome the introvert area of my graph—have tried this for years—still trying.

Less talking and chattering.

Share my experiences with others outside the staff and children.

I plan to seek out ideas more from others. I like my own ideas but others have much to offer, too.

I will continue to search for opportunities for personal involvement with people.

I plan to re-think my whole concept of teacher—teacher, teacher—consultant, and teacher growth constructs.

I work with groups of teenagers. I feel I know a little more about the workings of a group now. Also at school I hope I'll be more tolerant of the "owls".

I hope that each person (adult or child) with whom I come in contact will gain supportive assurance that will enable them, and me, to taste the sweetness of successful living and learning.

Be more sensitive to others feelings—be less judgmental as I tend to be.

Life is short—we should stop and give thanks to all the wonderful things we have around us—treasure the present—look forward to a bright tomorrow.

I hope to be less critical of people and try to really get to know them for what they are.

To become just a wee bit effective in my relationship with others as is Mary Jo. Be willing to fade into the background and still remain in a leadership role.

I sincerely hope as a result of this encounter that my judging of other people will be reduced. I feel that often I had some preconceived notion about someone that later proved false.

I think I will try to bend a little in dealing with others and not be so critical.

Try to do more self-fulfilling things so that I will have something to pour out when asked or needed.

Hope we can establish an open friendly attitude between teachers with our common goal—the welfare of the children both academically and personally.

5. <u>What do you see differently from when you started this workshop (in relation to people, concepts, ideas, etc.)?</u>

I see the few I thought unlikeable—likeable. I understand group processes better than I ever have. I feel genuine warmth for the individuals in the group.

How other people react to ideas, and other people. How easy it is to become closer to others.

It has restored some of my faith in people.

Our reason for coming was made much more clear to me.

That it is possible to acquire some of the qualities the people I admire possess.

People are great—they can work together harmoniously when they have an objective. Harmony justifies the end.

Closer to people—a sense of togetherness in our ideas and clear concepts of others ideas and feelings.

I realize many of my feelings are shared by others and I am perhaps not as unique as I had thought.

The closeness and common bond that can develop from a group such as this.

I've always believed that people are interested in helping and working with others but we get too wrapped up in our own activities. This has renewed my ideas that people do care.

Many people have similar interests, thoughts, creative ability, even sometimes fear of failure just like me.

It has been a good experience as it demonstrated what I've read but could never quite visualize—group leader's role—implicit instructions with freedom—that teachers are human.

I recognize now, more than ever, the great need for educators to be "leader-doormen" rather than "indoctrinator-surgeons".

I know more about myself and also how to recognize strengths in others.

I was surprised to find that I could be classified and identified within a group and that the people I have selected to work with are very similar in nature.

I see possibility of the world becoming ever more one world if more of this kind of work could be done with more people.

We look differently, act differently, but beneath the surface we are all much the same in likes, goals and attitudes and feelings about problems.

People who share a common bond (such as the groups' interest in teaching) develop many creative ideas as well as creative interpretations of concepts.

Why others think and act and feel the way we do and the great deal of interdependence there is in a group.

I'm an idealist and optimist at heart—always believing the best is yet to come and that one can do what one really wants to do. I see people as facets of a one-force so this was a pleasant affirmation.

That basically people are pretty much alike. That you cannot know a person from his appearance or from a casual conversation. You have to become involved with him.

6. <u>What part of the workshop was most helpful?</u>

The part that came between Friday afternoon and Sunday afternoon.

Techniques used by Mary Jo and some stimulating small group discussions.

Small group encounters and the test. It helped me to understand why some things about myself come about the way they do.

I was given an opportunity to show my love to someone who needed it.

Getting to know the people with whom we'll be working with this year. I enjoyed it all.

Large group, small group discussions revealing similar likes, dislikes, etc.

Small group participation and the method of handling a group so effectively for togetherness.

The small group sessions.

Small group problem solving and after discussions.

Relaxed atmosphere. The quiet, capable leadership in helping us to develop ideas.

The development of the interpersonal relationships.

Personality test - the stories read aloud - the group endeavors - making song, drawing - where we worked as a group but were individuals.

The quiet, effective leadership.

Putting trust in others (being led around with eyes closed) anticipating their desires and feelings and giving what they would like to experience.

Getting to know people in a different light. Sharing ideas. Listening to something other than the textbook talk - hearing people express the way they really think and feel - finding so many people that feel the same way I do.

Sitting in the small groups discussing different things because I got so much better acquainted in these groups.

The freedom of discussion - interchange of ideas and the just plain fun.

I enjoyed individual small group discussions where ideas and feelings were freely exchanged.

The personality test and all the explanations, questions and discussions that came of it.

The M-B test and interpretation. Concrete statements are necessary tools - action.

The involvement - the removal of inhibitions and following through with ideas even though at first one felt a little reserved in complying-sort of questioning.

7. <u>What part of the workshop was least helpful?</u>

None.

Nothing I can think of.

THE MARGINAL LEGIBILITY OF THIS PAGE IS DUE TO POOR ORIGINAL COPY. BETTER COPY WAS NOT AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF FILMING. E.D.R.S.

Late at night activities (don't believe it could have been corrected though).

Head part.

I would know no way to criticize it.

None.

All parts were helpful. I enjoyed the varied experiences.

Frankly, hand holding and head rolling didn't do a thing for me.

The lifting of heads.

For me perhaps, the hand-touch activities.

None that I am aware of.

The touching hands, lifting heads bit. Even though I think I'm affectionate, etc., I have some reticence in this area if it involves a member of the opposite sex.

The head rolling.

The head-rolling session.

The head routine and finger-hand touch—there seemed to be something missing.

I cannot at this time pin down anything that could be called least helpful. Everything turned out to have its place.

The closed-eye walk experiment.

All exercises were helpful in some way. Personally being led and leading with eyes closed left the least impact.

Finding animals for each person to be. This was so difficult it seemed forced and not real.

Short time.

It was all part of a whole—each part had its place.

8. <u>Are there any other comments (positive or negative) that you wish to make about this workshop?</u>

Excellent encounter.

It was better than I had hoped. I feel I gained insight into processes and personalities and have grown personally. I think we were fortunate in having a skillful and outgoing leader. There must be some reinforcement to this session.

Thank you! Thank you! Thank you!

Very thankful for such a worthwhile experience and the individual leadership Mary Jo gave to the group.

The leadership of the group was excellent. It was done in a very unpretentious way—it enabled us to respond easily and openly. Dr. Woodfin was ever-present but never dominating.

A very rewarding, relaxing experience.

The people were great—leadership excellent—organization/format very good. However, each time I take a personality test, etc., more about me is uncovered and I don't know whether I'm ready for this or not.

I feel an emotional growth - admiration for so many people and their opinions and a sense of having made friends that will disagree fairly without being disagreeable.

I felt the leadership role was very well assumed by Mary Jo. It was very low key but effective. It gave us a model for an effective classroom technique.

A fine worthwhile weekend, certainly not a lost weekend.

It has been a delightful experience.

Positive: Usually there is someone in a group that I am critical of—in this group I liked everybody probably because we got to know each other. Also, I like Charmayne now muchly, whereas before I was apprehensive a little about her and this program.

I sincerely wish that all of Bellflower's teachers could have known and shared this experience with us. Thanks.

Thank you. We have established a working group that will do more than attend meetings and occasionally give of themselves.

Really enjoyed it! Feels so different about others in the group.

This could be a wonderful yearly event to recharge our personal energy battery.

Dr. Woodfin has a unique talent for helping group members feel comfortable and relaxed. Although not directly observable by action she stimulated the group to work together in a most accepting manner.

It has been such a unique experience. How much everyone could benefit by taking part. I hope somehow we can share this with those we work and live with.

Liked openness—touching—interaction (verbal exchange)—liked lack of domination—liked guidance—feel friendly support.

It was done in a way that no one could take offense and yet even though one might feel some reservation, this was all disspelled.

APPENDIX 4.

Guide for Self-assessment for Teachers

NOTE: These questions were derived from discussions with teachers in the EPDA Project in the Bellflower Unified School District under the leadership of Dr. Ruth Larson, special consultant to the Project. It is hoped that other teachers in the district will engage in thoughtful discussion of self-assessment and produce a final guide for use of teachers in this and other districts. Logical consistency and orderliness have been sacrificed at this time for purposes of expediency and economy of time. In this and final form the purposes of the criteria is to encourage reflection and dialogue, rather than measurement and comparisons among teachers.

1. Are you searching for new ways of working with children?

2. Are you extending and deepening your own interests and abilities so that your resources for teaching are increasing?

3. How are you nurturing and maintaining your own and the children's enthusiasm for teaching and learning?

4. How are you channeling children's enthusiasm into effective and productive ways of working?

5. Are you encouraging children to be honest in their feelings and ideas?

6. Do you take delight in sharing surprises, secrets, and "happenings" with children?

7. Do you accept your own mistakes and view them as opportunities for your own self-improvement, as well as the children's?

8. Are children participants in your classroom planning and decision-making? How have you extended opportunities for this in recent weeks?

9. Have you worked out ways to work with children individually? Are you trying out different procedures with the children to see how they work?

10. Do you offer children significantly different choices of activities? Daily? Weekly? Monthly? Through the year?

11. Are you in tune with children's feelings and ideas? Have you found ways of spending time in talking with them about how they feel and what they think?

12. How much and what kinds of life space do you provide for yourself and the children in your classroom?

13. What bases do you tend to rely upon for deciding if your classroom work with children is effective?

    (a) Test results?
    (b) Children's enthusiasm and spirit?
    (c) Children's increasing creativity?
    (d) Children's improved classroom behavior?

13. Continued

(e) Your own feelings of satisfaction and comfort?
(f) Other _____

14. How has the pattern of pupil learning changed?

15. What do you think that the school district might do to help you in nurturing your own professional growth?

ELEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR CRITERIA OF SELF-IMPROVEMENT (WITH EXAMPLES)
Developed by Bellflower EPDA Project Teachers in Discussions, August 1969

Dimensions of Growth	AREAS OF CONCERN IN TEACHING					
	Feelings	Values	Ideas	Activities	Decision-Making	Productivity
Personal Integrity	Anger as well as love is respected.	People can be honest in what they believe.	Any idea can be considered.	People like to do their own thing.	Everyone has responsibility to make decisions.	What's mine is mine.
Creativity	People feel different about creating.	Some people value creating more than others.	People express ideas in their own ways.	Creating means different activities for different people.	Decisions come at different points.	Process may be more valuable than products.
Diversity	Variety is the spice of life.	People value their own and others' uniqueness.	The more ideas, the better!	People like doing different things.	There are different ways of making decisions.	The more, the merrier.
Versatility	There is a wide range of feelings.	We live in a pluralistic society.	Ideas are contagious.	Do-it-yourself has its own contagion.	Brain-storming - Better decisions.	Better things for better living.
Balance	Accepting differences of feelings.	Do we always have to be "good"?		Do we have to do that same old thing?	Teachers do have some basic authority.	Tear it up and try again.
Spirit and Humor	It's time to go already!!		Risk may lead to some ideas that fall flat.			
Esprit d' Corps	WE did it!!!					
Mobility	Gee, I'm not nailed down.					
Effectiveness	Ah-ha! I get it.					

APPENDIX 5.

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF EPDA PROJECT

PART I

A. What are the real benefits from this project as far as my building is concerned?

It has made each of us aware of the benefit to be gained by sharing ideas and techniques. We have been able to discuss areas of concern and build on the experiences of others to come to some program or solution. We have gotten to know each other and therefore are able to work better together.

Made our prinicpal aware that teachers can choose programs that will benefit them. He felt and stated teachers were unable to choose programs that were worthwhile. The upper grade teachers began to realize there was a kindergarten through third and they had opinions and vice versa. I feel there is more understanding among all teachers in the buildings.

A more meaningful in-service program.

It helped open up meaningful discussions in education. It provided an opportunity to share ideas and strengths. It helped to bring the staff together more on a friendly basis.

More rapport with individual teachers. More cooperation and sharing among the group. Experience and practice using the techniques of problem solving and inquiry.

Having a shortened day twice a month for professional development.

Teachers working together forming a continuous education for children. Communication on children's weaknesses in all grades, e.g., listening. Sharing of ideas without a feeling you're showing off. A real interest in each others successes and failures with different ideas. The release time has made this possible as the school setup makes communication poor.

I feel very undecided about trying to answer this question. I have seen what I consider individual growth, but would be reluctant to say what real benefits the entire building has received.

My feeling is that the teachers as a group are just beginning to loosen up—be able to carry on constructive meetings.

Our building (upper grades) has appreciated the early dismissed time and appears to have enjoyed most of the EPDA experiences.

There has been a better feeling among the faculty this year. The Myers-Briggs test especially seemed to create a closer relationship. Teachers have been sharing ideas much more freely. "In-service" was certainly improved.

I feel that the unity achieved by our teachers has been tremendous. This project has given us an opportunity to really know each other. We all are much more aware of the need and the importance of sharing ideas as well as being more open with our problems.

Use of closed circuit T.V. stimulated children and other teachers (not project representatives) to participate and share more openly in areas of reading and language arts. It seemed to bring feelings of reward and accomplishment for them. Closer feeling—more open feeling between representatives of project. I didn't stand alone when I wanted to try something different.

They have had the opportunity to use teaching aids such as the audio-visual equipment, dry-mount press, thermafax, etc., which were in the building or brought in specifically for EPDA. I hope it has made for more openness and honesty between teachers and with a desire on their part to encourage and assist others in arriving at goals which they have expressed as a desire to achieve.

Release time for in-service meetings. Beginning to establish better and more effective communications between the staff. The in-services are of more interest to the members of the staff.

Better communication between teachers and grade levels. The shortened day for in-service is of great benefit.

A closer relationship and a working together of teachers of all grade levels.

Some teachers enthusiastically participated in our workshops, appreciating the fact that they didn't have to leave their building. We worked in small groups. Many of the other staff members offered ideas for workshops and agenda for meetings.

There has been more sharing of ideas, good teaching practices, and more cross-grade involvement.

It has exposed the faculty to current practices in teaching. It has provided a vehicle whereby the teachers have exchanged ideas. It has increased social interaction between grade levels.

A. (1) As far as my own teaching is concerned?

I have tried many things without feeling as if I needed a specific approval. I have shared with others, failures as well as successes.

I am more aware of the whole school. The video tape made me aware of unnecessary gesticulation, nervous movements and other self defeating actions or voice control problems in my actual teaching. I have enjoyed trying out the various teaching techniques shared with the group by other teachers. I feel the other teachers are now more really interested in each other and the work they are doing.

It helped me identify methods and procedures that I had been doing previously.

It was a great opportunity to grow professionally, to be introduced to new and exciting techniques and methods of teaching. It helped me change my direction toward individualizing.

I feel that I gained further insight into my role as a teacher. The need to become a "facilitator of learning" rather than a director of learning is one concept that impressed me the most. I can see more opportunities for individualizing my program with this concept in mind.

A free feelingness that took step with curriculum. More aware of needs of children and reacting to their needs. It was also taught me we are partly equipped (educationally) to meet these needs. Must more research must come out on reading for example. Use as reach perceptual-motor problems, also numbers. I feel our diagnosis of these programs is good and even if we could diagnose, we don't know how to treat the child.

Also as the impetus to my individualizing in all areas.

I have benefited greatly from the EPDA program. The type of training we received was unique. I have had an opportunity to creatively individualize my reading and plenty of time to believe my techniques.

I know that I've been more eager to experiment with inquiry, creative writing and individualizing without the fear of possible failure.

I have had much more confidence to qualify the particularity to the training that comes. Like I have tried several new things (such as the vocabulary, creative writing) that I would not have probably if I had not been in the project.

I have refined little things. Been I'm just not finished.

I feel my teaching has benefited greatly from the EPDA experience. I have reorganized ideas by using program from previous years. I have individualized ideas all subjects. I feel next year I perhaps could do even more.

In many ways I have been more relaxed and less worried about

completing X number of subjects in X number of days or correcting every paper. In some other ways I was more aware of where I might go and wanted to go and found great disappointment and "let down" because of the height of enthusiasm projected in our meetings and books read—then to apply them to a very immature group of children was bad news.

I hope I have become a better listener in my relationship with my students and my fellow teachers. This in turn would help me be more sensitive to what they are trying to express and as a result I would be able to relate to them in an objective and helpful way. I feel more free to express my true feelings on matters rather than harbor resentment over something I don't agree with. I am definitely more aware of the technique of getting the student to come up with ideas and try to keep my talking to a minimum. I am more interested in attitude towards learning and thought processes than "facts for facts sake."

I have not been afraid to try new things and do not worry if they are not always successful.

Gained a better understanding of myself in our many training sessions. Restored some of my original desire to try more new things. I like to try different ideas in working with children as their needs are different. Gained new ideas and new methods. My faith in the possibility of a change in education has been restored.

A greater feeling of freedom to attempt innovative methods and ideas.

Having had a very difficult class this year, I found that the work of the CTRP did come a true blessing. She could work fairly effectively with the large groups. However, I did feel my greatest benefits came with the student reaction to inquiry teaching, as wrong as I felt it to be; and I enjoyed it.

Resulting from our summer experience, I have endeavored to be more of a listener and have tried to develop a group spirit in my class involving caring for each other, etc. Problem solving has been very successful. We have done some inquiry, some individualizing and considerable small grouping.

I felt the materials experience was very worthwhile to me as an individual. However, I feel as far as the project was concerned the feeling of closeness that was generated was rather short lasting. My teaching has been modified to include many ideas presented to us this year.

8. Do I enjoy problem solving in my own classroom? If not, why not?

Yes. I modified to children it.

Yes. As in general

Kindergarten teachers have always used problem solving techniques in the classroom. However, it usually deals only with child behavior. We all three are using it sparingly in math and other situations that will lend itself. But feel we need to explore it further before using it too much with a five-year old.

Yes.

Yes. I problem solve almost every day and schedule problem solving activities on Friday.

Yes.

Yes.

Yes, to some extent. How do we improve our reading? What do we need to know to read? We do our individual planning from a circle and discuss our days plans—then go our individual ways and I go from station to station helping individuals with their activity and discuss individual problems with each child.

Yes, I have Friday as problem solving day. This has helped some children, but not as many as I had hoped for, possibly, because I expected too much. I feel now that we need to start this in the first year of school and continue in every grade due to individual growth.

Yes, to a limited degree.

No, very time consuming.

Yes.

Yes, I have used it more this year, but had also used it some in the past.

No, except in a very loose individual term because of the age of the class (kindergarten).

Yes.

No. I found I needed more training in it or a class with less problems to solve!!

Yes, we like it.

Yes.

6. Do I notice more of an effort toward individualizing my program? How?

Yes. By making individual work plans and contracts on the complexity of each work. More reading is done in small groups or to individuals as needs are determined. Very little reading

is done to the class altogether—music, social studies discussion.

This has been the main teaching technique used in kindergarten. We have explored it much further and have been pleased with the results. This has been used in form of student helper from our own class group. Those who know, teach those who don't; aided by teacher of course. It has strengthened the actual learning carry-over.

By doing individualizing throughout the day. I've always done it in readying but now in addition spelling, arithmetic (for two classes), social studies to a greater degree, and art. I do not work with my own class in science or language.

Yes. Inquiry. Problem solving. Listening.

Yes. Completely individualized reading, social studies—moving into individualized science and spelling and math. Children choose their own projects in social studies under specific units. I have two aides who help me in reading. Children keep their own reading records. I conference with them quite regularly. I do not give out report cards. I have conferences with parents and children and use a written report in its (report card's) place.

Yes. I started out slowly. I began in the area of math and am now concentrating my efforts in reading.

We have a tutoring program. My poor readers help 2nd grade. This has been a good thing for both groups. Individualized reading (not now though). About ½ o my class does not get social studies or science except on minimal basis due to various tutoring programs. Children in tutor program get extra help in areas they have problems (outside tutors). Mother helper—during reading (assigned four students).

Yes, completely—each child works on his own after planning with me for their weeks work. I feel the planning ahead and then following through on their plan is an important concept for developing responsibility and good study habits.

Yes, by individualizing almost my entire program.

As much as possible—by any means possible—flexible scheduling for example.

Yes, a little—yet the kindergarten program is different and has been individualized.

Yes. I have almost completely individualized my math, this I never tried before. The same is true with spelling and many children have already completed both spelling and math. I've always done this in reading.

I have varied individualizing by having two "readers" or

first-grade level continue on their own in primer readers and in their number books. The usual grouping exists in three reading groups and those who seem to need it have been sent to Miller-Unruh or speech for individual help. One has been tested for the M.G.M. program. Our EPDA aide enables me to guide the accelerated readers or give special help to the slowest achievers.

Yes, I am. By expecting different types of achievement from individuals—by setting different goals for individuals. Use of teacher aide (when available) to work on a one-to-one with students.

I have actually individualized my program as much as possible with the present structure of schedules and extended days. It is my firm feeling that a more individual approach is essential before we reach many of the problems that remain unsolved in our schools.

Yes, although the kindergarten program has always been individualized to a great extent.

Our departmental program has involved so much of my time that individualization of the program has had to take a back seat.

Yes; reading and science are areas where I have really tried to individualize. Others more at times.

Not much. Looking out for individual differences—yes. Actual separate work for each individual—no.

Yes, with the use of the EPDA aide individualizing increased particularly in teaching mathematics.

9. Am I using inquiry techniques? In what areas?

I'm trying. Science, social studies.

Some, but only in science or where a logical answer can be reached. Not too successful at this age.

Yes. Language, social studies, science and math.

Very little at the present time. I am beginning to get my feet wet. The children responded well to my first two science lessons. I will continue this technique in science.

Yes. Math and science—although not too often in the past. Feel I know much more about inquiry now to use it more often.

Science, social studies, health, music and language.

Social studies, arithmetic and reading.

I usually use them (at our III level) in science and problem solving (social behavior).

I have tried to come up with some reading type questions for inquiry but it's coming slowly. Although I find I am starting to think more along the lines of inquiry and that's a good beginning.

Yes. I feel more secure with inquiry in science and math. I try at various times to use this approach in math and social sciences, but that isn't so easy. I need to do more research myself and have others share their program with me.

Some.

No.

I'm beginning to use it in science and social studies.

Yes, in all areas where it is applicable. Language, arts, science and social studies.

No, because of grade level.

Science, and some in all areas of the curriculum, but still need to work on this area.

Yes—science and I want to try some questions in the area of social living.

Yes and I love it. Science and social studies right now.

Yes, science, social studies, math and English.

Yes, mathematics.

E. Have I consciously used any techniques to evaluate myself better since being in this project? What?

I have been conscious of evaluating myself—looking at specific actions, classroom behaviors, etc. I have been especially conscious of what I'm doing for each child. However, I don't know of any technique that I have consciously used.

Yes. First, the use of my voice. I have watched very carefully to see overall and let the talking come from the children. Problem solving to a greater degree. The constant questioning of the children for their decisions in all matters possible.

I believe it is through the reactions of my children and how they feel about school, subjects and me as a teacher.

Yes. Tapes and self constructive criticism.

Yes. Video tape; children-teacher conferencing; just re-evaluating outcomes of lessons.

Video tape and recorder (tape).

I have evaluated myself with the use of the tape recorder. Also; but not nearly as much as I should, I have used the video tape. Also the way in which the children respond to the learning activity in my room has given me many clues to my effectiveness (e.g., pressuring, too high expectations, forcing).

Yes, I've taped myself several times and evaluated my techniques of encouraging self evaluation and thinking of the students. I have felt this was one of the most important areas of work in the EPDA Project and wanted to try to make as much growth as I could as an individual because I was given the opportunity to participate.

No, I don't think so. But I do evaluate and re-evaluate constantly.

No.

No.

I've tried to be more honest with myself in daily teaching. I use the tape recorder frequently in all subjects. It's easy, goes by un-noticed by children. In problem solving at the beginning of the year I used the recorder for every session, listened to the tape and went back and read Driekur's and read over the information from Barbara Neff.

Tape recorder; introspection—reading; conferences with principal; visiting another school—same grade level.

Yes, I have. Tape recorder to hear myself work with the children, to check my voice, expression, clarity of thought, and the amount of talking I do. We have also made a couple of audio-visual tapings.

The sheets we received in the project that we could use to evaluate our teaching techniques.

No.

I hope—the use of the tape and discussions with other teachers and a reflection into my own motives and approaches to teaching.

I have used video tape and tape recorder for self evaluation.

I try to be more tactful and considerate, because sometimes I'm too honest. Actually, I don't think I have tried much self-evaluation. The opportunities for leadership this year has been fun.

Yes, video tape equipment.

APPENDIX 6.

Education Professions Development Act Director

October 20, 1969

MEMO

TO: Dr. Wampler and the Board of Education

FROM: EPDA Participants

RE: Released time for in-service activities in connection with the EPDA Project

The essence of the EPDA Project in our district is professional development through a carefully planned sharing program under the leadership of the Project teachers. The emphases of this program as outlined in the Project are as follows:

1. focusing on pupil learning rather than teaching

2. individualizing the instructional program to provide for individual needs and abilities and continuous progress learning

3. utilizing available resources, new curriculum and new techniques for more effective use with children

4. improving pupil learning through improved teacher-child relationships

The initial phase of the 18-month Project (the training of the Project Teachers) has gone extremely well. It will be impossible, however, to implement phase two, a serious sharing program, without some released time when all staff members can meet together to confer, share techniques and concerns, and focus on professional development. For this reason and for the purpose of giving the project a fair trial, we involved in the EPDA Project request that released time to ensure to two minimum days a month for students beginning November, 1969, be scheduled by the Board of Education for the five Project Schools.

Attached is a detailed plan for utilization of the released time developed by the staffs of the project schools. The in-service plan includes the areas of development to be covered, the nature of the offering (workshop, demonstration, conference, etc.), the number of projected 30-minute sessions for any given activity, the leader or presenter, the building.

This plan while detailed is tentative in so far as any in-service plan should be responsive to the needs of a staff at any given time. The schedule proposed is based on a 30-minute in-service session. This would provide a minimum day for primary of 210 minutes and an upper grade minimum day of 240 minutes. Individual buildings would be responsible for notifying parents of the shortened day schedule prior to each in-service day.

SUMMARY OF NEEDS CITED
by
PROJECT STAFFS FOR BUILDING IN-SERVICE
AT THE BEGINNING OF PROJECT PERIOD

When the EPDA Project was launched in the five pilot schools the teacher trainers surveyed the staffs for suggestions on how in-service sessions could best meet their needs. The following summary represents what teachers felt their particular needs were in terms of in-service programs at the beginning of the school year 1969-1970. This was a departure from previous in-service programs because it involved a shifting of the decision making functions from administrative staff to teaching staff. Here is the summary of the topics teachers wanted in-service to deal with.

Discovery approach to teaching science.

Social studies activities.

Effective ways to prepare for science demonstration.

Use of music instruments.

Use of audio-visual equipment.

Making musical instruments.

Group activities to aid visual perception and coordination in the primary grades.

Acquainting the faculty with the services of special personnel (speech, music, guidance, curriculum).

Sharing ideas for games and instructional aids in math.

Review of new books for children by building librarian.

Demonstration (videotape) and discussion of good parent conference techniques.

A sharing workshop in the arts and crafts.

Workshop on primary music program.

Group discussion for the purpose of evaluating classroom activities: use of teacher-made discs, elimination of busy work, etc.

Sharing sessions on revision of report methods to parents.

Use of sessions on individualizing in the instructional program.

Using the curriculum workshop under direction.

Workshop on effective disciplinary procedures in the classroom.

Sharing sessions on articles from professional journals and books.

Workshop on working with perceptually handicapped children.

PROPOSED INSERVICE PLAN FOR 1969-1970
EFSA PROJECT SCHOOLS

NOVEMBER

SCHOOL	DATE	TOPIC	TYPE	GR. LEVEL	LEADER
[illegible]	11/10	Effective parent conferences	demonstration - discussion	primary	L. Van Stralen
[illegible]	11/10	An effective P.E. program	discussion	upper	B. Candelaria
[illegible]	11/10-11/24	Grade level team planning	conference	general	
[illegible]	11/24	Rote harp	workshop	general	C. Stevenson
[illegible]	11/24	Self assessment	workshop	general	P. Biggerstaff
[illegible]	11/10	Effective parent conferences	demonstration - discussion	primary	B. Norell
[illegible]	11/10	Use of video tape equipment	workshop	general	L. Zucker
[illegible]	11/10	Rote harp	workshop	general	C. Stevenson
[illegible]	11/25	An effective P.E. program	discussion	upper	B. Candelaria
[illegible]	11/25	Grade level team planning	conference	general	
[illegible]	11/25	Making musical instruments	workshop	general	C. Stevenson
[illegible]	11/10	Effective parent conferences	demonstration - discussion	primary	A. Glenapp
[illegible]	11/10	Use of video tape equip.	workshop	general	M. Cook

[redacted] (continued)

[redacted]	DATE	TITLE	TYPE	GR. LEVEL	LEADER
[redacted]	[redacted]	Grade level team planning	conference	general	
[redacted]	[redacted]	Motivation for reading	demonstration - discussion	primary	A. Sinclair
[redacted]	[redacted]	Use of video tape equipment	workshop	general	F. Schumock
[redacted]	[redacted]	Individualizing reading	discussion - sharing	primary	R. Bowman
[redacted]	[redacted]	Individualizing reading	discussion - sharing	upper	P. Kruse
[redacted]	[redacted]	Inquiry in math	workshop	upper	F. Schumock
[redacted]	[redacted]	Grade level team planning	conference	general	
[redacted]	[redacted]	Quiz bowl	workshop	general	C. Stevenson
[redacted]	[redacted]	Problem solving with children	demonstration - discussion	primary	R. Bulrice
[redacted]	[redacted]	Problem solving with children	demonstration - discussion	upper	E. Wilson
[redacted]	[redacted]	Grade level team planning	conference	general	

DECEMBER

SCHOOL	DATE	TOPIC	TYPE	GR. LEVEL	LEADER
Jefferson	12/8	individualized reading	discussion + sharing	k-1	L. Von Strelow
Jefferson	12/8	individualized reading	discussion + sharing	2-3	P. Biggerstaff
Jefferson	12/8	individualized reading	discussion + sharing	4-6	E. Campbell
Jefferson	12/8	Grade level conferencing	conference	general	
Jefferson	12/12	Language experience	demonstration + discussion	primary	P. Biggerstaff
Jefferson	12/12	Inquiry in math	demonstration + discussion	upper	E. Campbell
Jefferson	12/13	Self assessment	workshop	general	E. Bateman
Lindbergh	12/8	Self assessment	workshop	general	L. Zucker
Lindbergh	12/8	Visual perception and construction	workshop	primary	L. Brenneman
Lindbergh	12/8	individualized reading	discussion + sharing	upper	K. Hendricks
Lindbergh	12/12	Inquiry in math	discussion + sharing	upper	K. Hendricks
Lindbergh	12/12	Language experience	demonstration + discussion	primary	E. Bateman
Lindbergh	12/12	Grade level conferencing	conference	general	

2

DECEMBER (continued)

SCHOOL	DATE	TOPIC	TYPE	GR. LEVEL	LEADER
Mann	12/8	Individualizing reading	discussion - sharing	primary	M. Cook
Mann	12/8-12/15	Problem solving with children	demonstration - discussion	primary	A. Gienapp
Pyle	12/8-12/15	Problem solving with children	demonstration - discussion	4-6	D. La Rue
Pyle	12/8	Motivation for reading	demonstration - discussion	primary	R. Bowman
Pyle	12/8	Self assessment	workshop	general	F. Schumock
Pyle	12/15	Effective parent conferences	demonstration - discussion	primary	R. Bowman
Pyle	12/15	Motivation for reading	demonstration - discussion	upper	P. Kruse
Pyle	12/15	Auto harp	workshop	general	C. Stevenson
Ramona	12/12	Individualizing reading	discussion - sharing	primary	D. Edgington
Ramona	12/12	Individualizing reading	discussion - sharing	upper	E. Wilson
Ramona	12/19	Effective parent conferences	demonstration - discussion	primary	S. Heintzelman
Ramona	12/19	Individualizing in the social studies	discussion - sharing	upper	E. Beck
Ramona	12/19	Use of materials	discussion	general	G. Dunkley

JANUARY

SCHOOL	DATE	TOPIC	TYPE	GR. LEVEL	LEADER
Jefferson	1/12	Inquiry in math	demonstration - discussion	upper	E. Campbell
Jefferson	1/12	Art ideas - use of the kiln	workshop	general	
Jefferson	1/12	Motivation for reading	demonstration - discussion	primary	L. Van Stralen
Jefferson	1/12-1/26	Problem solving with children	demonstration - discussion	primary	P. Biggerstaff
Jefferson	1/26	Motivation for reading	demonstration - discussion	upper	J. Stanton
Jefferson	1/26	Grade level team planning	conference	general	
Lindstrom	1/13	Inquiry in math	demonstration - discussion	upper	L. Zucker
Lindstrom	1/13	Art ideas - use of the kiln	workshop	general	L. Branscum
Lindstrom	1/13-1/27	Problem solving with children	demonstration - discussion	primary	B. Nerell
Lindstrom	1/27	Grade level team planning	conference	general	
Lindstrom	1/27	Motivation for reading	demonstration - discussion	upper	K. Hendrick
Mann	1/12	Individualizing in the social studies	discussion - sharing	primary	A. Sinclair
Mann	1/12	Self assessment	workshop	general	P. Rutherford

JANUARY (continued)

SCHOOL	DATE	TOPIC	TYPE	GR. LEVEL	LEADER
Mann	1/26	Individualizing in math	discussion - sharing	primary	M. Cook
Mann	1/26	Grade level team planning	conference	general	
Pyle	1/12	Inquiry in math	demonstration - discussion	upper	F. Schumock
Pyle	1/12	Art ideas - use of the kiln	workshop	general	P. Kruse
Pyle	1/12	Language experience	demonstration - discussion	primary	R. Bowman
Pyle	1/26	Rhythm and dancing	workshop	primary	S. Kenney
Pyle	1/26	Grade level team planning	conference	general	
Pyle	1/26	Inquiry in science	demonstration - discussion	upper	F. Schumock
Ramona	1/16	Individualizing in the social studies	discussion - sharing	primary	R. Bulrice
Ramona	1/16	Self assessment	workshop	general	E. Beck
Ramona	1/30	Individualizing in math	discussion - sharing	primary	S. Heintzelman
Ramona	1/30	Training upper grade tutors	workshop	primary	V. Craghead
Ramona	1/30	Grade level team planning	conference	general	
Ramona	1/30	Motivation for reading	demonstration - discussion	upper	E. Wilson

FEBRUARY

SCHOOL	DATE	TOPIC	TYPE	GR. LEVEL	LEADER
Jefferson	2/2	Encouragement approach to learning	discussion - sharing	general	L. Van Stralen
Jefferson	2/2	Individualizing in the social studies	discussion - sharing	primary	P. Biggerstaff
Jefferson	2/2-2/16	Inquiry in science	demonstration - discussion	upper	E. Campbell
Jefferson	2/16	Effective P.E. program	discussion - sharing	primary	B. Candelaria
Jefferson	2/16	Grade level team planning	conference	general	
Lindstrom	2/17	Inquiry in science	demonstration - discussion	upper	K. Hendrick
Lindstrom	2/17	Encouragement approach to learning	discussion - sharing	general	B. Nerell
Lindstrom	2/17	Motivation for reading	demonstration - discussion	primary	L. Branscum
Lindstrom	2/24	Individualizing in the social studies	discussion - sharing	primary	B. Nerell
Lindstrom	2/24	Grade level team planning	conference	general	
Lindstrom	2/24	Inquiry in social studies	demonstration - discussion	upper	L. Zucker
Mann	2/2	Language experience	demonstration - discussion	primary	V. Brown
Mann	2/2-2/16	Grade level team planning	conference	general	

FEBRUARY (continued)

SCHOOL	DATE	TOPIC	TYPE	GR. LEVEL	LEADER
Mann	2/16	Encouragement approach to learning	discussion - sharing	general	P. Rutherford
Pyle	2/17	Inquiry in science	demonstration - discussion	upper	F. Schumock
Pyle	2/17	Language experience	demonstration - discussion	primary	C. Bohman
Pyle	2/24	Encouragement approach to learning	discussion - sharing	general	D. La Rue
Pyle	2/24	Grade level team planning	conference	general	
Pyle	2/24	Use of materials	discussion	general	G. Dunkley
Ramona	2/13	Language experience	discussion - sharing	primary	M. Dixon
Ramona	2/13	Encouragement approach to learning	discussion - sharing	general	D. Edgington
Ramona	2/13-2/27	Inquiry in science	demonstration - discussion	upper	E. Beck
Ramona	2/27	Grade level team planning	conference	general	

DIMENSIONS OF SELF-OTHER RELATIONSHIPS *
(Peer Relationships)

DIRECTIONS: Check dimension chosen.

	3	2	1		1	2	3	
TRUST								
Intimacy								Coldness
Supportive								Destructive
Low Defensiveness								High Defensiveness
Low Fear								High Fear
Caring								Rejecting
Genuineness								Affected
OPENNESS								
Awareness								Estrangement
Self-revealing								Masking
Spontaneous								Reticent
Empathic								Non-perceptive
Reality oriented								Distorted reality
Warmth								Formality
REALIZATION								
Wellbeing								Anxious
Eagerness								Apathy
Confidence								Self-distrust
Flexible								Rigid
Participative								Alienated
Self-esteem								Self-derogation
INTERDEPENDENCE								
Freedom								Inflexibility
Spontaneous								Guarded
Cooperation								Antagonism
Adequacy								Inadequacy
Actualization								Dependency
Non-judgmental								Opinionated

*Developed by Dr. Evelyn L. Blackman, California State College at Long Beach, from TORI processes, as developed by Jack R. and Lorraine M. Gibb, Western Behavioral Sciences Institute

APPENDIX 8.

Dimensions of Teacher-Child Relationships * (classroom climate)

Directions:	Circle Rank Chosen					
1. Warmth	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
2. Perceptiveness	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
3. Flexibility	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
4. Attention to the individual	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
5. Involvement	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
6. Enjoyment	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
7. Enlistment of child participation	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
8. Encourage individual responsibility	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
9. Allows expression of feeling	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
10. Encourage creativity-diversity	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
11. Teach concepts	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
12. Ingenuity	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
13. Utilization of standard resources	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
14. Task effectiveness	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
15. Multiplicity of themes or approaches to problems	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
16. Nonfunctional explanation of rules	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
17. Rule orientation	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
18. Dictation of procedural detail	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
19. Personal need for structure	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
20. Punitiveness	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3
21. Fairness	-1	-2	-3	+1	+2	+3

*Adapted from Teacher Rating Scale by O. J. Harvey, et al, supported by a Career Development Award from the National Institute of Mental Health, No. K03 MH28117.

APPENDIX 9. a.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES

BETWEEN THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

ON THE T O R I PRE AND POST

SCALE	Pre-Scores						Post-Scores					
	Exp		Control		Difference	t	Exp		Control		Difference	t
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD			$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
T	10.85	5.39	9.84	3.62	1.01	.68	12.00	3.13	11.41	3.48	.59	.53
O	10.60	5.31	8.94	5.92	1.66	1.38	11.95	3.88	10.29	5.13	1.66	1.07
R	12.55	4.13	9.47	4.17	3.08	2.30*	13.00	3.45	10.76	4.35	2.24	1.68
I	9.40	4.10	8.73	3.08	.67	.57	11.55	3.67	11.52	2.63	.03	.03

* Statistically significant beyond the 5% level of confidence.

APPENDIX 9. b.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES

ON THE T O R I FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL TEACHER GROUP,

PRE AND POST

SCALE	Pre-Scores		Post-Scores		Difference	t
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
T	10.85	5.39	12.00	3.13	-1.15	.83
O	10.60	5.31	11.95	3.88	-1.35	.91
R	12.55	4.31	13.00	3.45	- .45	.38
I	9.40	4.10	11.55	3.67	-2.15	1.75

APPENDIX 9. c.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES

ON THE T O R I FOR THE CONTROL TEACHER GROUP,

PRE AND POST

SCALE	Pre-Scores		Post-Scores		Difference	t
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
T	9.84	3.62	11.41	3.48	-1.57	1.29
O	8.94	5.92	10.29	5.13	-1.35	1.05
R	9.47	4.17	10.76	4.35	-1.29	.88
I	8.73	3.08	11.52	2.63	-2.79	2.84*

* Statistically significant beyond the 5% level of confidence.

APPENDIX 9. d.

SUMMARY OF THE MEAN DIFFERENCE

PRE AND POST ON THE T O R I OF THE EXPERIMENTAL TEACHER GROUP

BY THE DIRECTOR

SCALE	SCORES				Difference	t
	Pre-Scores		Post Scores			
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
T	7.47	2.30	12.42	4.78	4.95	4.22**
O	8.21	2.28	12.11	4.01	-3.90	4.04**
R	8.42	3.39	12.53	4.25	-4.11	4.06**
I	9.00	2.79	12.26	3.93	-3.26	3.83**

** Statistically significant beyond the 1% level of confidence.

APPENDIX 9. e.

SUMMARY OF THE MEAN DIFFERENCE

PRE AND POST ON THE T O R I OF THE EXPERIMENTAL TEACHER GROUP

BY THE PRINCIPAL

SCALE	Pre-Scores		Post-Scores		Difference	t
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
T	9.25	3.60	12.56	2.94	-3.31	4.51**
O	9.13	2.42	12.25	2.73	-3.12	5.23**
R	11.38	3.10	13.38	2.50	-2.50	1.91
I	10.81	2.70	12.75	3.23	1.84	2.45*

** Statistically significant beyond the 1% level of confidence.

* Statistically significant beyond the 5% level of confidence.

APPENDIX 9. f.

SUMMARY OF THE MEAN DIFFERENCE

PRE AND POST ON THE T O R I OF THE CONTROL TEACHER GROUP

BY THE PRINCIPAL

SCALE	Pre-Scores		Post-Scores		Difference	t
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
T	11.92	2.73	11.08	3.43	.84	1.30
O	13.15	3.23	11.46	3.95	1.69	1.65
R	13.62	2.98	12.15	3.76	1.47	1.22
I	13.08	2.97	11.31	3.42	1.77	1.54

APPENDIX 10. a.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE

OF THE CLASSROOM CLIMATE OF THE EXPERIMENTAL TEACHER GROUP

AS EVALUATED BY THE PRINCIPAL, PRE-POST

Pre-Scores		Post-Scores		Difference	t
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
23.40	15.23	32.73	14.42	9.33	2.04

APPENDIX 10. b.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE

OF THE CLASSROOM CLIMATE OF THE CONTROL TEACHER GROUP

AS EVALUATED BY THE PRINCIPAL, PRE-POST

Teacher		Principal		Difference	t
X	SD	X	SD		
39.28	18.06	39.35	17.26	.07	.03

APPENDIX 10. c.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES

OF THE CLASSROOM CLIMATE OF THE EXPERIMENTAL TEACHER GROUP

AS EVALUATED BY THE DIRECTOR, PRE-POST

Pre-Scores		Post-Scores		Difference	t
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
10.10	11.27	24.57	7.81	14.47	4.52**

**Statistically significant beyond the 1% level of confidence.

APPENDIX 10. d.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE OF

CLASSROOM CLIMATE AS PERCIEVED BY THE EXPERIMENTAL TEACHER GROUP

COMPARED WITH THE PRINCIPAL AND PROJECT DIRECTOR POST

COMPARISONS									
Teacher		Principal		t	Teacher		Director		t
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	
33.15	8.54	32.73	14.66	.01	33.15	8.54	24.57	7.81	3.58**

** Statistically significant beyond the 1% level of confidence.

APPENDIX 10. e.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE

OF CLASSROOM CLIMATE AS PERCIEVED BY THE CONTROL TEACHER GROUP

COMPARED WITH THE PRINCIPAL - POST

Teacher		Principal		Difference	t
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
33.35	7.28	39.35	17.26	6.00	1.25

APPENDIX 11. a.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES

BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL TEACHER GROUPS

ON SELECTED SCALES OF THE MMPI, PRE AND POST TESTS

SCALE	Pre-Scores						Post-Scores					
	Exp		Control		Difference	t	Exp		Control		Difference	t
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD			$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
K	18.47	2.14	16.66	3.17	1.81	1.51	19.10	2.88	19.33	2.72	- .23	.25
L	3.42	2.09	2.50	2.84	.92	.93	3.62	1.69	3.08	1.32	.54	.95
MF	37.05	5.02	38.91	3.42	-1.86	1.18	38.21	6.01	41.75	2.75	-3.54	2.08
SI	29.26	4.82	30.41	4.79	-1.15	.63	28.79	5.15	29.16	6.01	- .37	1.95
AT	7.36	3.23	10.25	4.18	-2.89	1.97	8.00	3.29	9.25	3.71	-1.25	.92

APPENDIX 11. b.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES

BETWEEN SELECTED MMPI SCALES FOR EXPERIMENTAL TEACHER GROUP,

PRE AND POST TEST

SCALE	Pre-Scores		Post-Scores		Difference	t
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
K	18.47	2.14	19.10	2.88	.63	-1.27NS
L	3.42	2.09	3.62	1.69	.20	- .53NS
MF	37.05	5.02	38.21	6.01	1.16	-1.44NS
SI	29.26	4.82	28.79	5.15	.47	.52NS
AT	7.36	3.23	8.00	3.29	.64	-2.12*

* Statistically significant beyond the 5% level of confidence.

APPENDIX 11. c.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES

BETWEEN SELECTED MMPI SCALES FOR CONTROL TEACHER GROUP,

PRE AND POST TEST

SCALE	Pre-Scores		Post-Scores		Difference	t
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
K	16.66	3.17	19.33	2.72	2.67	-1.99NS
MF	38.91	3.42	41.75	2.75	2.84	-2.11NS
SI	30.41	4.79	29.16	1.90	1.25	.80NS
L	2.50	2.84	3.08	1.32	.58	-1.16NS
AT	10.25	4.18	9.25	3.71	1.00	.88NS

APPENDIX 12. a.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES

BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL TEACHER GROUPS

ON THE M T A I, PRE AND POST TESTS

GROUP	Pre-Test		Post-Test	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Experimental	42.95	16.71	55.37	17.11
Control	29.17	23.41	30.94	21.58
Difference	13.78		24.43	
t	1.99NS		3.70**	

**Statistically significant beyond the 1% level of confidence.

APPENDIX 12. b.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES

BETWEEN SCORES ON THE M T A I FOR EXPERIMENTAL TEACHER GROUP,

PRE AND POST TEST

TEST	Pre-Scores		Post Scores		Difference	t
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
M T A I	42.95	16.71	55.37	17.11	12.42	-3.04**

** Statistically significant beyond the 1% level of confidence.

APPENDIX 12. c.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES

BETWEEN SCORES ON THE M T A I FOR CONTROL TEACHER GROUP,

PRE AND POST TEST

TEST	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Difference	t
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
M T A I	29.17	23.41	30.94	21.58	1.77	.44NS

APPENDIX 13.

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF PROJECT

PART II

A. Has the concept of team leadership functioned effectively? If not, why not?

Yes.

Team leadership is a new term to me when referring to our four. Does this refer to two planning the projects? All the programs I was told to conduct Ihad to do by myself.

Yes, however Ifelt during the year that some teachers resented the project or at least did not feel it had any meaning.

Not at first, some were afraid they would not get their share of the "limelight."

I feel there were some ill feelings. The project was not seen as worthwhile by all. Some teachers are not interested in any outside meetings—even if they were excused from teaching they complained vigorously.

Yes.

No, too many of our EPDA teachers were so busy in their classrooms that they seem to have forgotten about "helping" other teachers. Too—their own interests came first—then other ideas.

Yes.

Not enough meetings. One member new to staff—rapport had to be built in two directions. Principal's participation role was hazy at first. Once established—better.

I think the team leadership has been effective in the over-all picture. I felt that in the beginning of the school year some of our team members went "over-board" and some teachers resented the constant conversation of EPDA. Many ideas, at least in our school, have been used for years, for example, individualized reading, math, etc. I do feel we have improved in this area.

Not as effectively as it could. I think some of us weren't sure what our role was. Also designating one person to be the one to meet with the program director, etc., more or less conveyed the idea this was the person who had the designated authority to coordinate our program. Also I think we're all so conscious of encouraging others ideas, etc., we tend to hold back rather than project our ideas.

I feel that the team leadership concept encompasses the entire faculty. Almost all teachers in the school feel a part of the "faculty team." This concept of team leadership is a goal of the faculty for next year.

Yes, we had a very good cooperative EPDA group.

To a certain extent the team has functioned effectively. This second semester there has been much decided prior to our team meetings however.

We have had some problems in the beginning because of personality conflicts but they have calmed down greatly.

Yes—for three of us—but we lacked communication with one member. She felt that she and her grade level should operate as a single entity.

Yes, among the majority of the staff. We have some wonderful people with which to work. I feel it has brought the two halves of our faculty closer together. At least I appreciate their problems more.

Pretty much so. Except for a few minor problems, most people came through in the end. Some of the teachers who grumbled, turned out to be very good in-service helpers and led some fine programs. The four of us who were leaders have worked together quite well, I think.

Differences in grade level and scheduling caused a breakdown in communication, which resulted in the alienation of one member of the team.

B. Have any teachers in my building shared their strengths? How many?

Yes. Many of them have shared ideas and techniques through group discussion and the showing samples. One ran an entire 1½ hour in-service and did an excellent job.

Yes. This has been the glory of the program as far as I'm concerned.

About five or six.

Yes. About six.

Some—not as many as could have. One led an in-service in reading and the librarian volunteered to lead an in-service scheduled for later on in the year. We have met as a group and shared activities in art and everyone did share his favorite activity.

Two different EPDA sessions were used for this purpose. First, Miller-Unruh teacher and primary teachers shared their perceptual and beginning reading ideas. Second, art ideas were shared. Also there were sessions involving the techniques of problem solving and inquiry. The EPDA participants presented their experiences with these techniques.

Yes, about five teachers.

During our in-service this has definitely happened. There has been some exchange teaching but very little. They are very cooperative about taking an extra class for P.E. while someone visits, etc. We plan to exchange strengths (teach one area) for one hour a week starting in the near future.

Not much. Several of us have shared in some ways but perhaps we should look into the ways we could encourage teachers to get involved. Maybe a signup sheet or a drive for volunteers to share teacher strengths. If teachers could sign up for what they would like to teach others could then sign up for what they were interested in and all would not be required to attend all meetings.

Yes, three or four.

Yes, ten or twelve.

Almost every teacher has shared strengths in some way. EPDA team in video tapes and tape recording. Other teachers have shared methods, materials, games, etc. We haven't made the most use of the video tapes due to many reasons; namely—the problem of setting it up, poor tapes because of sound problems. We need more in-service on that.

Yes, in reading. All in various areas of follow-up seat work - art work. We have usually all cooperated in this vein.

Most (<u>all</u>) of the teachers Ihave asked for help personally have been more than happy to help. Between individuals I feel a good relationship.

Yes, four.

Yes.

All I have been in contact with have done their very best and we have all been appreciative of everyone's efforts.

Yes, six, and one more is willing to have us tape an art lesson in her classroom in its entirety. However, our video tape equipment isn't operable right now.

Yes, I haven't kept track of all our meetings. I would say beside the four leaders—about seven have helped lead in-services. As far as "in-general" sharing of strengths— yes, they have.

Yes, several have become involved in sharing and exchanging teaching methods.

APPENDIX 14.

COMPARISON OF VIEWS OF PRINCIPAL'S ROLE

Participants were asked to respond to the question "Has my prinicpal's role changed? How?" and principals were asked to respond to "Has my role changed? How?" Below, by school, are the responses of the teachers and the principals. (Note: Because of the one woman principal involved in the pilot program, all pronoun references have been edited to insure anonymity.)

School A

Participants' Responses:

Yes, he has become a member of a group rather than "the leader." However, when we don't take the initiative he goes back to his former role.

Yes, he is much more willing to let us try things. I think he has much more confidence in his teachers—that they are working very hard to teach the children.

The principal of the school has always assumed a strong leadership role. His desires were usually not questioned. He is now, however, more open to others suggestions. The individual faculty members feel more free to voice their own opinions. He listens to both sides and functions effectively as a team member.

I feel he is much more open for new ideas and that he has been positively caught up in making a change for the entire school. He is less defensive. He has taken an active role in innovating. At first the group of EPDA met regularly to discuss how and what the in-service sessions would be like. However it seemed that when we relinquished the role of prime movers then the principal's role seemed to change accordingly. He has assumed the major burden for these in-service meetings.

Principal's Response

Yes, more initiative and leadership assumed by teachers. I became more of a team member.

School B

Participants' Responses

No.

No.

No, he is still outside the effort, fearful of losing any of his controls.

Principal's Response

No.

School C

Participants' Responses

He doesn't communicate with all of us on the team equally. There seems to be more communication with some members of the team. He has taken more of a guiding direction towards keeping us moving on the project the last few months. All the staff knows who the "boss" is.

I feel that he really did not change as he was very receptive to the program from the first.

I feel that he has really been interested and helpful. I think he has been a most effective "team" member but has usually tried to let us "do our own thing." There have been times that we have not been aware of decisions until they have been made but this is understandable, usually, as two of our members are such busy people that it is difficult to always reach us in time. And, after all, he still is principal.

Principal's Response

Comparing my present role with the one assumed in other schools, I feel that it has changed. Referring decisions concerning in-service to a teacher committee and being willing to live with the decisions they reach has been a somewhat new experience. Gone are the days, I feel, when the role of the administrator is to dictate from on high. We are now involved in a shared-leadership role.

School D

Participants' Responses

He has been most cooperative, interested and enthusiastic. Without his support, it would not have been possible to carry out the project.

Yes. He has been willing to let us try new ideas. Often "thinks about" something now before giving an immediate unchangeable answer. He has tried to help sometimes rather than criticize. He has become much more cooperative.

My principal has worked very well as a team member and has definitely been encouraging and supportive of the program.

Principal's Response

Not significantly. I do tend now even more to involve the staff in decision making.

School E

Participants' Responses

We should have had them involved from the first. He was perplexed much of the first part of the year about his role. Yet I feel the project is getting better as we have continued trying to find our way in good faith.

You bet! Without him, this program would have died long ago. He tried everything possible to make it a team project.

I'm not sure. Sometimes I feel much more free and honest in my relationship with him and yet sometimes I feel he is inclined to give more credence to a "special few." I have felt much more free in expressing my opinions hoping they would be taken in an objective way. I hope he feels as free to tell me what he thinks. Sometimes I'm not sure he does.

Principal's Response

No—I am still in charge, tried not to be, but had to assume role.

APPENDIX 15.

LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE TO THE PROGRAM

May 16, 1969

Mrs. Elma Beck
5434 North Whitewood Avenue
Lakewood, California 90712

Dear Elma,

It is my pleasure to inform you that you have been selected by your colleagues to participate in our Education Personnel Development Act project.

As I have explained to staff in our meetings, the purpose of our EPDA project is to train teachers to provide in-service leadership. Our goals are really two: the most immediate goal is to train you as leaders in your building; the second and more long-term goal is to involve able teachers in a voluntary in-service program which will facilitate sharing unique teaching strengths.

If you have any questions or reservations about participating in our project, I would appreciate your cailing me on Extension 260 or at my home - 430-3411 - before May 23, 1969.

I would also appreciate your keeping your selection confidential until we are able to get firm commitments from all selectees and alternates. We prefer to make one official announcement from our office concerning the participants in the project.

I would like to meet with all of you on Tuesday, May 27th, at 3:30 p.m. in the Curriculum Lab at Central Office. At this time we will give you a calendar and make specific plans for the summer.

Sincerely yours,

Charmayne Bohman
Project Director

CB/meb

APPENDIX 16.

LETTER TO COMPARISON GROUP

September 4, 1969

Mrs. Marilyn Russell
141 Syracuse Walk
Long Beach, California 90803

Dear Mrs. Russell:

As you know, we have asked five non-project schools to participate as a comparison group for the research portion of our EPDA project. Your staff, following the same procedures as in our five project schools, have selected you to represent your building. I think you will find that your participation, while limited, will be of professional and personal value.

We have scheduled a meeting on Thursday, September 11, at 1:00 at Woodruff school. At that time, Dr. Evelyn Blackman, one of our consultants will meet with you and fully explain your role.

Sincerely yours,

Charmayne Bohman
Project Director

CB/gr

APPENDIX 17.

LETTER TO PARENTS - RELEASED TIME

BELLFLOWER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Education Professions Development Act Director

November 3, 1969

Dear Parents:

On October 28, 1969, the Board of Education approved a recommendation from the Superintendent of Schools to provide two minimum days per month for teacher in-service programs. The five schools which will initially be involved are those schools participating in the Education Professions Development Act program. These five schools are Thomas Jefferson, Esther Lindstrom, Horace Mann, Ernie Pyle, and Ramona.

The in-service days will serve to enhance the instructional program in our schools by providing time for teachers to learn new techniques and develop additional effective ways of working with children.

The day selected for in-service at Esther Lindstrom School is Thursday. On two Thursdays a month, we are asking children in the afternoon kindergarten classes to report for school at 11:00 a.m. They will be dismissed those two days at 2:00 p.m. We realize this is an unusual time for beginning our kindergarten class, but must do so in order to provide the minimum school day required by state law. Teachers will arrange for children to have a cookie or cracker snack with their milk on those days.

The two Thursdays scheduled for November are November 6 and November 13.

If you have any questions, we would be happy to talk with you. We are pleased to have our school involved in this special in-service program, for it is a splendid opportunity to improve the educational program for your children.

Sincerely,

Kirk J. Real, Principal
Esther Lindstrom School

Charmayne Bohman, Project Director
Education Professions Development Act

APPENDIX 18.

BELLFLOWER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
EPDA PROJECT

Inservice Preference
Ernie Pyle School
Thursday, November 13, 1969
2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Please indicate your choices by end of school Monday so that we can adequately plan for this month's inservice.

F 1. Inquiry in math - Fred Schumock

A. Fernandez
R. Brennan
E. Coleman
E. Johnson.
Nelson
Graham
Jones
Santala
Inhesiate

D, 2. Techniques for team planning - Dee LaRue, discussion leader

C Atterbury
Rudolph
O. Stallsmith
C. Slakey

P. 3. Effective parent conferences - Pauline Kruse, discussion leader, video tape demonstration

L. Nunez
Helen Thompson
Charles Grey
Helen Wallace
B. Schonbeck
A. LaVelle
R. Parker
M. Wilkinson
K. Ahmad-White
G. Steers
J. Payne

4. Other

THE MARGINAL LEGIBILITY OF THIS PAGE IS DUE TO POOR ORIGINAL COPY. BETTER COPY WAS NOT AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF FILMING. E.D.R.S.

APPENDIX 19.

INQUIRY TRAINING SESSION

BELLFLOWER SERIES

DAY I

Stu	4:00-4:30	Objectives of the Training Program . Sets I & II for participants . Teach others to use Set I . Post critique each activity - seminar in May
Bob		One Liners - Inquiry not the only way to teach Learner autonomy
Stu	4:30-5:00	Review data-theory loop, with First Flight
Bob	5:00-6:00	IB #2, groups of 3, and discuss
	Dinner	
Stu, Bob	7:00-7:45	Pasit #1 with T system - chart Set I TB
Stu, Bob	7:45-8:30	TB #1A - work alone or in pairs with lecturette on Set I teacher behaviors
Stu, Bob	8:30-9:15	Adult Inquiry - drinking duck (2 groups) tape and critique with T system
Stu, Bob	9:15-10:00	Leadership Critique
		"Homework" - IB #1, "Inquiry an Answer", tape a lesson (?)

AV equipment - 2 overheads
2 tape recorders
16mm projector

INQUIRY TRAINING SESSION

BELLFLOWER SERIES

DAY II

Stu	4:00-5:00	Generalize Interaction Patterns TB 1B with strip transparencies
Bob	5:00-6:00	Simulation - using pulse glass G4 for 5" each, participants critiques after each, using V, E, St
	Dinner	
Stu, Bob	7:00-8:15	Adult Inquiry, pre and post, with "Elk, Colo." T System, teacher to use Set II and process dialogue
Stu	8:15-8:45	Lecturette on Set II behaviors
Stu, Bob	8:45-9:30	Pasit #5 with T system and Set II
Bob	9:30-10:00	Getting Ready to Teach Input on Pulse Glass, Duck Tape for use next time

AV equipment - 16mm projector
2 overheads
4 tape recorders & tape
slide projector

INQUIRY TRAINING SESSION

BELLFLOWER SERIES

DAY III

Bob	8:30-10:00	Talkdown on teaching experience
		Analyze tapes
Stu	10:00-11:00	Set II - identifying teacher behaviors
Bob, Stu	11:00-12:00	Mini-Adult Inquiry, Hutterites and Thelen
	Lunch	
Stu	1:00-2:30	Creating Set II behaviors (strip transparency)
Bob, Stu	2:30-3:00	Film loops
	3:00-3:30	"Hawg Caller"
		"Homework" - teach and tape Set II
		Bob - input on Cartesian Diver
		Stu - input on bimetallic strip

AV equipment - 4 tape recorders & tape
1 overhead projector
1 screen
2 8mm film loop projectors & loops

INQUIRY TRAINING SESSION

BELLFLOWER SERIES

DAY IV

Bob Stu	4:00-4:15	Talkdown, collect materials Discuss tapes
Stu	4:15-4:45	Set III Introduction-Lecturette
Bob	4:45-5:15	TB3A, Generating Diagnostic Data
	Dinner	(leadership function)
Stu	7:00-7:30	Problem Focii - What makes a good one?
Bob Stu	7:30-8:00	Mini-Adult Inquiry with Process Dialogue in small groups Film Loops
Bob	8:00-8:30	Mississippi River Puzzle with critique
Stu	8:30-	Inquireeze

AV equipment - 1 overhead projector
1 8mm film loop
2 screens

tall the three trees oak

small cakes our birthday four

Task: regroup each set in a way that sounds like English -
- in what way are 1st, 2nd (example) groups of words alike? (generalize a rule for order of modifiers)

JUNCTURE

1. Are you a teacher?

2. Is your school an elementary school?

3. How many students will you have?

4. How many teachers teach at your school?

5. Are you wearing a white dress?

Generalization:

Task: Ask these questions of members of class—note the type of answer (yes/no, short phrase) when voice rises on end of sentence (1,2,5) and when voice falls (3,4). Generalize a rule on juncture in question—type sentences.

1. The man _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ .
2. The boy _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ .
3. I _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ .
4. She _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ .
5. We _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ .
6. You _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ .
7. No one _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ .
8. The men _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ .
9. The boys _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ .
10. Everyone _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ .

S I N G

Task: Generalize a rule for when to add "s" to root verbs like sing.

ELK, COLORADO - "Why was the town deserted?"

A. Attendant data

1. Name of town is Elk.
2. Located in Colorado, Longitude 107°30'W, Latitude 40°30'N.
3. Elevation 6,200 feet.
4. Elk is on U. S. Highway 40 and on the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad.
5. Elk is in the Yampa Valley, 10 miles East of Craig, Colorado (pop. 4,000); and 36 miles West of Steamboat Springs, Colorado (pop. 2,000).
6. Population today, 0.
7. Elk was inhabited by people for 13 years, 1920-33.
8. Population between 1920-33, 190.
9. Land on which town is located was and is owned by railroad.
10. Primary industry of the town was bituminous coal mining for the railroad and nearby coal-using markets.
11. The Denver and Rio Grande, Western Railroad was completely dieselized by 1936, no longer needing coal.
12. The railroad is still in active use as far West as Craig.
13. The bituminous coal is still available.
14. Future predictions indicate that the coal may well be mined again for thermal-electric power in the growing need for electricity.

B. Consequential Variable

The entire economy of the town was based on the coal mining operation, since the town was company owned. When the coal mining operation ceased there was no need for the company to maintain the town.

C. Generalizations

1. Where there is no demand for a goods, it is unprofitable to continue to produce the item.

2. A single industry-economy community is in danger when there is no longer a demand for the goods produced by that industry.

3. Where new demands are created it may again be profitable to produce goods that were once obsolete or not needed.

D. References

1. U. S. Census, 1920-60.

2. Denver and Rio Grande Railroad, Frank H. Thomas, Northwestern University Press, 1966.

3. Moody's Transportation Manual, 1965.

E. Other:

Rainfall 23" year.

Largest coal reserve of any state in nation.

THEM	US
REJECT CITIZENSHIP	CITIZENS
DON'T PAY PERSONAL TAXES	PAY TAXES
DON'T VOTE	DESIRE TO VOTE
REFUSE TO BEAR ARMS	BEAR ARMS
DON'T REPORT BIRTHS/DEATHS	REPORT BIRTHS/DEATHS
HOME STILLS	NO HOME STILLS
BURY DEAD IN PINE BOX	MORTUARY
These people live in the U.S.	These people live in the U.S.

PROBLEM FOCUS

How is this group of people able to live in the U.S.?

Situation: THE HUTTERITES

Problem Focus: How is this group of people able to live in the United States?

Materials Needed: One overhead projector and the Hutterite transparency.

Data: Location: There are 169 Hutterite Colonies. Following is list of where they are located:

62 in Alberta, Canada
42 in Manitoba, Canada
15 in Saskatchewan, Canada
26 South Dakota
21 Montana
and
1 colony each in Minnesota, North Dakota and Washington State

The Hutterites are often referred to by neighboring townspeople as "Hoots."

No musical instruments are used in the colonies.

There is a great deal of written communication between the colonies.

All property is community owned.

The meals are taken togethar - men seated on one side of the table and the women seated on the other side. The children eat at another time schedule.

Hard work and no nonsense is a way of life for the Hutterites. "No playing of any kind for the adults is acceptable" - (a quote from one of the colony leaders).

Holidays that are celebrated are restricted to: Christmas, New Years and Easter.

The Hutterites ferment their own wine and brew their own beer.

German is spoken as the primary language in the colonies (Tyrolean dialect).

There is legislation restricting Hutterite Colonies from acquiring additional land through purchase in the following places: Alberta, Canada; Manitoba, Canada; South Dakota and Montana - (declared unconstitutional by the Montana State Supreme Court).

The Hutterites - Continued

Data: The Hutterites live in communal communities and there are no wages paid to any member of the colony for their work. They pay no individual Federal Income Tax. They are exempt as a religious non-profit institution. Each colony is organized as a "Communal Corporation" under State Charters and this corporation does pay taxes in an effort to maintain good standing in their respective States.

The Hutterites are successful large-scale diversified farmers...raise various animals.

They have the world's highest birth rate - averaging 12 children per family.

There are many similarities between the Hutterites, the Amish and the Mennonites. (The Hutterites use machinery in their work whereas the Amish do not).

The Hutterites are pacifists. They refuse to bear arms. There is no recorded case of military service among the Hutterites. They have, however, served in hospitals, etc., in service to their country.

Skillful Financial Managers:

1. Produce and make most of what they need.
2. Buy in quantity - e.g., truckload of watermelons.
3. Only 2.5 percent of total cash expenditure is for food.
4. Only one percent of all cash expenditure is for clothing - (inasmuch as they make their own clothes).
5. The Hutterites assist other colonies when there is a need.

Townspeople and merchants harbor suspicion and anamosity toward the Hutterites.

1. They purchase very little in the local retail stores.
2. They live "differently."

Special Patterns in Housing:

1. Buildings maintain proper relationship to one another.
2. People live in apartments (space added as family increases).
3. No kitchens (meals served in community kitchen).
4. Color of their buildings reflect usage (red - commercial).
5. Public school house is yellow and front faces the State road rather than the colony). (Schooling reflects outside world.)

Temporal patterns set - right order for all activity:

1. Rise at 6:15 a.m. 6:30 breakfast. 7:15 to 9:00 work. Break and snack. 11:45 lunch. Work to 6:30 p.m. Assemble for Church service. Supper 7:00.
2. Individuals have little free time.
3. Sunday: Church, visiting and rest.

The Hutterites - Continued

Social Relationships are patterned and broken into four categories:

1. "House child" - until two years old - then kindergarten until five.

2. "School child" - from six to fourteen.

3. "Young people" - fifteen until baptism.

4. "Baptized members" - at various ages....they make their own request....women at 19-20....men 20-26. Soon after baptism they marry.

Women are considered inferior to men intellectually and physically. They are expected to show humility and submission.

Women do not help make colony decisions or elect leaders.

Women work in the home primarily - prepare food, raise vegetables, etc.

Men work at income producing phases of the colony.

The child and individual is taught to be obedient, submissive and dependent on the community (colony).

269 persons left the colony voluntarily between 1880 and 1951. Over half returned.

Children learn to accept authority from any member of the colony.

Children punished but fault or guilt pattern avoided.

At marriage the women leave their colony and join the man in his colony....(they do not marry within their own colony - the family relationships are too close).

Men grow a beard when they marry.

Courtships: length, two to six years.

All members of colony respect the aged.

Origin:

The Hutterite Sect was founded in 1528 by Jacob Hutter in Austria.

In 1773 the total Hutterite population (about 100) moved to Russia due to religious persecution in Austria.

In 1874 some of the Hutterites settled in South Dakota, having migrated from Europe to avoid military duty.

(The name "Hutter" is German for "hat.")

They are an Agrarian religious group. Religion is Protestant - Anabaptist (adult baptism).

The Hutterites - Continued

Dress: Men - beards, black hats, black coats, suspenders, high waisted black trousers.

Women - ankle-length dresses, polka-dot shawls, long aprons, hair covering. They never cut their hair.

Population:

Colonies average one hundred people (per one colony).

When a colony reaches a population of 120-150 people, the group is divided into two parts. Lots are then drawn to determine which group remains. The other leaves to begin a new colony.

Total Hutterite population - about 17,000 plus.

Education:

Children attend "English School" through the eighth grade.

The "German Teacher" is the main disciplinarian of the young in each colony.

All children in the colony attend the "German School" in addition to the "English School."

State Law requires school attendance through the age of sixteen within the States where the Hutterites live. These states have chosen not to enforce this requirement among the Hutterites.

Few, if any, attend public high schools.

APPENDIX 20 *

The teacher or child poses a problem of cause and affect. The children attack the problem with questions and experiment, by which they gather data to test a theory. In this experiment I posed the problem: "Why does the duck's head go down into the water?"

Questions and comments by the children.

1. Is he drinking?
2. Will he drink again?
3. Does he really drink the water?
4. (Comment from another child) No, because the water isn't getting littler.
5. I think there is a little spring in the thing that's holding him and this makes him swing.
6. I think he goes down because the water is cold.
7. I think I know why, when the duck goes down, the red stuff goes down into his head and makes it heavier than the round part.
8. I think the bill sucks up the red liquid and then it goes back down to the bottom and the whole thing starts all over again.
9. I think it works like a see-saw.
10. Well, I think it works like this, the beak touches the water and cools it and then it goes swinging back and forth and the water evaporates from the beak and it isn't heavy anymore.
11. You want to know what I think. I think the little molecules can't get out, so they keep pushing on the red liquid.
12. Teacher: Is there something we could try to prove some of your theories?
13. We could try letting him have warm water.

    Experiment
14. He's going slower now. Let's count the swings.
15. I think he likes cold water better.
16. Well, he's not alive, you know.
17. I know an experiment. Let's put ice in the water and see if he moves faster or slower.
18. Would your hand do it?
19. How can we ever get him to stop?
20. Take away the water.
21. Dry his bill.
22. Teacher: Was this fun today?
23. Yes, but who was closest to being right?
24. I like it because we can see what happens.
25. I like it because we can keep on trying experiments.
26. Well, I still think the head has something to do with it ducking all the time.

* The above are responses of 2nd graders in Mrs. Sandra Heintzelman's class at Ramona School as they inquired into the problem of the "drinking duck."

APPENDIX 21.

SUGGESTIONS ON HOW TO CONDUCT PROBLEM SOLVING GROUP DISCUSSIONS

1. It is usually advisable to set up a specific time each week for the group discussion to take place, so that the children can plan ahead for this.

   a. Usually (except in an extreme emergency), specific problems should be held over until this time; the children can expect that they will be brought up.

2. It is usually advisable to talk about a fictitious case not related to specific classroom behavior to start with.

   a. The next step might be to make a fictitious case out of a problem which actually exists in the class, but without mentioning any names. The children will know who is involved, but use of names should be avoided, <u>unless</u> the child referred to himself brings his own situation up.

3. Occasionally, you may find it necessary to bring the students into your confidence about a particular child who most of the children dislike for one reason or another. Some kind of errand can be formulated to get this child out of the classroom, while the others are discussing his case.

   a. The major emphasis on such a case <u>must be</u>, "How can we help this child feel that he belongs to the group." Usually the children will express negative feelings toward the child in question, but the teacher should keep wondering out loud, "How can we help this child?" as well as, "Does he do this because he's really mean (stupid, cross, or however he is initially labeled) or because he feels he can't get recognition or attention any other way."

   b. Generally, if the pattern of the discussions has been established, children will bring up ideas as to how such a child can be helped to get recognition through constructive activity. It is also remarkable how they will go out of their way to refrain from reacting negatively to such a child, even when provoked.

   c. Essentially, the major emphasis here would not be attempting to make the child special, but "How can we help him to better become a member of the group?"

4. Once the pattern has been established where the children bring up their own individual problems for the group to discuss, the above may not be necessary---except in extreme cases of revengeful or severely discouraged children.

5. Emphasis should <u>always</u> be toward the four goals of misbehavior, and <u>never</u> deeper, except to point out the child's need to belong, to be liked and wanted by others. There is little likelihood of your getting into trouble in these discussions, regardless of the personal nature of the problems presented, as long as you stick to this rule.

a. Your effort should always be toward getting the children to express these goals in their own words, as much as possible, with your interpretations only coming if they cannot seem to bring them out through questioning.

b. Goals are only understood by children when expressed functionally, or in terms of activity or movement, i.e.

(1) AGM: "He did it because he wants the teacher to make a fuss over him, to pay attention to him, etc."

(2) Power: "He did it to prove he was the boss, and could do what he wanted without anybody stopping him."

(3) Revenge: "He did it to get even, because he thinks everybody is against him and wants to hurt him."

(4) Display of Inadequacy: "He wants everybody to leave him alone."

6. Always refrain from contradicting or speaking critically of any student's offering, <u>even if it is wrong, punitive, or negativistic</u>. The best way to handle it is to ask others what they think of this, do they agree or disagree and why. Usually statements such as this are refuted very quickly without the student involved feeling you are censuring him.

7. Don't stand aside completely and let the conversation go on unrestrained; however, it will either get out of hand or bog down very quickly if this happens.

8. Don't attempt to jump in and solve the problem until it has been thoroughly explored.

9. Don't let the children humiliate one another. If such a statement is made, ask other children what they think about it. If they tend to agree, you might say, "Do you really think he's just mean, stupid, etc., or "Don't you think there might be another reason for what he's doing?" to try to lead them toward the goal of the misbehavior, and ways to help the child change his behavior.

10. Once the children at any level find out you are willing to let them say anything they want, and that the purpose of the discussions is to help them with personal problems, you will be amazed at the freedom with which they will express themselves. They will also display a spirit of cooperativeness and helpfulness. You may make mistakes to start with, but if the above rules are followed, your chances of making serious errors are negligible. The results far exceed your expectations.

APPENDIX 22.

GUIDE LINES FOR TRAINING EPDA AIDES

Aides must be trained by the project teacher in the areas of emphasis of the project: individualizing the instructional program. The effective role of the aides, therefore, is that of an <u>instructional</u> assistant who helps the teacher individualize her program by

1. Working with small or large groups of children to free the teacher to work with individual problems or small groups.

2. Assisting with video taping for evaluation and sharing projects.

3. Taking charge of the entire class while the teacher visits another classroom.

4. Assisting the teacher in the preparation of materials that enhance the individualizing process.

5. Assisting teachers in demonstrations and other phases of the inquiry process.

As soon as aides are comfortable with their responsibilities, they are free to assist non-project teachers with similar tasks. Generally, the initial phase of the training period should last about six weeks.

The key factor to keep in mind is that the aide is to be used in the instructional process and is not to be used as a clerical assistant. It is an assumption in our project that as a teacher moves to student centered learning there will be a marked increase in oral participation and less use of prepared materials and other busy work. Here are some examples of the kinds of activities that instructional aides should be trained to do:

1. Reading aloud to the entire class or small groups.

2. Working with an individual or a committee on special projects.

3. Getting the room ready for a science demonstration or an art activity.

4. Working with small groups of children on math skills.

5. Supervising an entire class engaged in independent study.

6. Setting up and running video-tape equipment.

7. Putting stories on tape for listening posts.

8. Assisting with physical education activities.

9. Assisting with handwriting development.

APPENDIX 23.

New Teacher Retraining Project Established Here

Establishment of in-service consultant service for the Pellflower Unified School District is now under way following district board approval of funding for the pilot project, part of a national program sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education.

The service consists of on-the-job teacher re-training designed to maintain the excellence of instruction in the district, according to Charmayne Bohman, project director and curriculum consultant for the district.

The Bellflower project was drafted under the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) and was one of 625 proposals accepted from 3,100 applicants. Only four Los Angeles County school districts applications were accepted.

In the pilot program beginning next fall, five of the best teachers at each of five district elementary schools will be selected by a joint committee of district elementary schools will be selected by a joint committee of district administrators, representatives, of the teachers association, and faculty from the individual schools.

Participating schools are Ramona, Ernie Pyle, Esther Lindstrom, Horace Mann, and Thomas Jefferson.

Extension of the program is planned for the fall of 1970 to include all 14 elementary schools in the district and for fall 1971 to include the four secondary schools as well.

Teachers participating in the pilot program will be trained by EPDA consultants in specially-designed summer workshops and will form a core of teachers assisting other teachers. According to one district spokesman, the program was designed under the theory that "the best people to teach teachers are other teachers."

Consultants for the project include Wayne Young Associates, composed of California State College, Long Beach professors Dr. Young, Dr. Aileen Poole and Dr. Evelyn Blackman; California State College, Dominguez Hills professors Dr. Ruth Martinson and Dr. Ruth Larson; Cal State at Long Beach professor Dr. Mary Jo Woodfin; graduate student Helen Irlan; and Glenn Davis, project director for the Paramount School District.

The consulstats will act as instructors for one to four days in the workshops. Those who are on college staffs receive $125 per day, others receive slightly less.

Wayne Young Associates was allocated $5,500 for services during the 18-month pre-planning and project development stages. They assumed the task knowing they would be paid only if the project was funded.

THE MARGINAL LEGIBILITY OF THIS PAGE IS DUE TO POOR ORIGINAL COPY. BETTER COPY WAS NOT AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF FILMING. E.D.R.S.

APPENDIX 24.

ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

BECK, Mrs. Elma
5434 N. Whitewood Ave.
Lakewood, CA 90712
RAMONA - 9351 E. Laurel
Bellflower 90706

BIGGERSTAFF, Mrs. Patricia
4457 Haxelnut
Seal Beach, CA 90740
THOMAS JEFFERSON -
10027 E. Rose, Bellflower

BOWMAN, Mrs. Clarissa
15134 Santa Ana Avenue
Bellflower, CA 90706
ERNIE PYLE

BRANSCUM, Mrs. Lucile
1615 West Road
Whittier, CA 90603
ESTHER LINDSTROM

BULRICE, Mrs. Ruth
9327 Bigby Street
Downey, CA 90241
RAMONA

CAMPBELL, Mrs. Edith
3918 Gondar Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90808
THOMAS JEFFERSON

COOK, Mr. Marvin
5433 Rome Avenue
Cypress, CA 90630
HORACE MANN

EDGINGTON, Mrs. Dawn
9569 Mandale Street
Bellflower, CA 90706
RAMONA

GIENAPP, Mrs. Aileen
3613 Petaluma
Long Beach, CA 90808
HORACE MANN

HEINTZELMAN, Mrs. Sandra
8115 Stewart & Gray Rd.
Downey, CA 90241
RAMONA

HENDRICK, Mrs. Kathryn
4231 East Pearl Circle
Cypress, CA 90630
ESTHER LINDSTROM

KRUSE, Mrs. Pauline
6244 Hedda
Lakewood, CA 90713
ERNIE PYLE

LA RUE, Mrs. Mercedes
2509 Ladoga Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90815
ERNIE PYLE

NERELL, Mrs. Barbara
5716 Belen Street
Long Beach, CA 90815
ESTHER LINDSTROM

RUTHERFORD, Mrs. Patricia
6382 Glenknoll Drive
Yorba Linda, CA 92685
HORACE MANN - 6144 N.
Clark, Lakewood 90713

SCHUMOCK, Mr. Fred
3728 Monogram
Long Beach, CA 90808
ERNIE PYLE - 14500 S.
Woodruff, Bellflower

SINCLAIR, Mrs. Alma
9251 Walnut
Bellflower, CA 90706
HORACE MANN

VAN STRALEN, Mrs. Linda
8538 Sixth Street
Downey, CA 90241
THOMAS JEFFERSON -
10027 E. Rose,
Bellflower

WILSON, Mrs. Elaine
13625 Mar Vista - Apt. 8
Whittier, CA 90602
RAMONA

ZUCKER, Mr. Louis
14520 Plantana Drive
La Mirada, CA 90638
ESTHER LINDSTROM
5900 N. Canehill,
Lakewood